REPORT RESUMES

ED 017 943 CG 001 283

A STUDY OF TESTING PRACTICES IN MINNESOTA PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

BY- JOSELYN, EDWIN G.

MINNESOTA UNIV., ST. PAUL, STUDENT COUNSELING BUR.

PUB DATE NOV 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$1.25 HC-$11.28 280P.

DESCRIPTORS- *STATE SURVEYS, QUESTIONNAIRES, *TESTING PROGRAMS, *SECONDARY SCHOOLS, TEST INTERPRETATION, *ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, TEACHERS, SCHOOL SYSTEMS, INTELLIGENCE TESTS, APTITUDE TESTS, ACHIEVEMENT TESTS, READING TESTS, INTEREST TESTS,

THE INTENT OF THIS PROJECT WAS TO ASSEMBLE BASIC DATA ABOUT CURRENT TESTING PRACTICES IN MINNESOTA SCHOOL SYSTEMS. PREPARED WERE TWO QUESTIONNAIRES, ONE FOR THE ELEMENTARY AND THE OTHER FOR THE SECONDARY LEVELS. THEY WERE DESIGNED TO BE AS SIMILAR AS POSSIBLE. THE TABLES CONTAINING THE DATA FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES ARE THE HEART OF THE REPORT. THE TEXT SUMMARIZES THE INFORMATION FROM THE TABLES AND CALLS ATTENTION TO THE FINDINGS, PATTERNS, AND RELATIONSHIPS. DESCRIBED ARE--(1) STUDY AND QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNS, (2) GENERAL SCHOOL PRACTICES RELATING TO TESTING, (3) TESTS USED IN MINNESOTA SCHOOLS, (4) THE REPORTING, INTERPRETATION, AND USE OF TEST RESULTS, (5) HIGH SCHOOL TESTING PROGRAMS, (6) PLANNING FOR CHANGE, AND (7) POSSIBILITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT. THE DATA INDICATE THAT ALTHOUGH ELEMENTARY TEACHERS HAVE CONSIDERABLY GREATER RESPONSIBILITIES FOR INTERPRETING STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS TO PARENTS AND PUPILS, THEY HAVE LESS BACKGROUND, LESS EXPERIENCE, AND LESS ASSISTANCE THAN SECONDARY TEACHERS IN THE EXECUTION OF THIS DUTY. THE AMOUNT OF TESTING WAS FOUND PROPORTIONAL TO THE SCHOOL SYSTEM, WITH THE MOST TESTED STUDENTS IN MINNESOTA THOSE IN SUBURBAN SYSTEMS. THE EFFECT OF SYSTEM SIZE ON THE QUALITY OF THE TESTING PROGRAM WAS FOUND TO BE CONSIDERABLE. (IM)

ED017943

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Minnesota Testing Programs

A STUDY OF TESTING
PROGRAMS IN MINNESOTA
PUBLIC SCHOOLS

EDWIN GARY JOSELYN

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Code: XXXIII-A-1

A STUDY OF TESTING PRACTICES IN MINNESOTA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

by

Edwin Gary Joselyn
Minnesota State-Wide Testing Programs
Student Counseling Bureau
University of Minnesota

The *Minnesota Guidance Publications* edited by:
Reynold Erickson, Director, Pupil Personnel Services
Julius H. Kerlan, Guidance Consultant
G. Dean Miller, Guidance Consultant

Conducted in part with funds made available through the provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Title V-A and through the Cooperation of Minnesota State-Wide Testing Programs, Student Counseling Bureau, University of Minnesota

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

1967

CG 001 283

Subcommittee on Testing
of
The Minnesota State Advisory Committee on Guidance and Pupil Personnel Services

Paul Ingwell, *Chairman*,
Professor of Educational Psychology,
St. Cloud State College, St. Cloud

Roger M. Adams, Director,
Elementary Education,
Wayzata Public Schools

Robert J. Casanova, Counselor,
De La Salle High School, Minneapolis

Donald Clauson, Director
of Curriculum Development,
State Department of Education

Keith Dawson, Counselor,
St. Louis Park High School (1965-66)

Gary Joselyn, *Project Director*,
and School Testing Cousultant,
State-Wide Testing Programs,
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

Gerald Thompson, Counselor,
St. Louis Park High School (1966-67)

Julius Kerlan, Guidance Consultant,
State Department of Education

Special Committee advisors for this project:

R. W. Bergstrom, Principal,
Hutchinson High School

E. L. Vitalis, Superintendent of Schools,
Kasson-Mantorville Public Schools

Preface

The Minnesota Department of Education is committed to a continuing examination of the practices which it encourages in the schools. Testing is one of the practices which is of current concern nationally as well as in our own State and this present effort is an attempt to gather together a picture of what is happening in the schools with regard to testing.

It is our plan in the Department to study the data collected and opinions expressed along with other information and make appropriate recommendations and plans on the use of tests in our schools.

This study is part of a continuous effort to examine guidance practices in order to search for better solutions to the educational task before us.

We trust the findings of this study will also be of interest to other groups and especially to the many individuals who cooperated in furnishing the basic information.

Reynold M. Erickson, Director
Pupil Personnel Services

Introduction

Around the nation, Minnesota is known for cold weather, iron ore, lakes, and tests. The University of Minnesota is the center of much test activity; tests developed here include the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, the Minnesota Counseling Inventory, the Minnesota Vocational Interest Inventory, and the Minnesota Clerical Test. Minnesota schools administer a lot of standardized tests.

Most citizens of Minnesota know this and, indeed, many citizens of other states, particularly professional educators, know this. Minnesota has a national reputation as being a State which "believes" in tests. With this reputation, unfortunately, often goes the implication that Minnesota educators make too many decisions, and the wrong kinds of decisions, on the basis of test scores alone. In fact, it is not clear that Minnesota students do take more tests than students in other states, and certainly there is no evidence to suggest that Minnesota educators are any less skilled in the use of test results than their colleagues from other states. Indeed, because of their experience, they may be more skilled.

Reputations not withstanding, little is really known of testing practices in Minnesota schools. This is surprising when one considers that Minnesota school systems do use many standardized tests, that the State Department of Education has a small but active and influential guidance section, and that Minnesota has one of the nation's most extensive state-wide testing programs. Yet, it is true; there is little basic information about testing programs in Minnesota schools; what tests are given at what grades, who interprets the results to students and parents, what do Minnesota educators think of their testing programs.

The Minnesota State Board of Education, a group of laymen, is dependent upon advisory committees to keep them current and to make recommendations for policy decisions. One such committee is the Minnesota State Advisory Committee on Guidance, and Pupil Personnel Services. As the name suggests, this committee advises the State Board of Education on matters having to do with guidance, counseling, and testing in Minnesota public schools. The committee has a subcommittee on testing which assists the parent committee on matters having to do with testing. This subcommittee is responsible for the research reported here.

As the testing subcommittee met during the 1964-65 and 1965-66 school years it became more and more aware of the situation discussed above—we know very little about the nature of school testing programs in Minnesota schools and the feelings, opinions and needs of those who operate them. As this awareness crystallized the subcommittee decided to embark on this study with funds available through the National Defense Education Act.

The intent was to assemble basic data about current testing practices in Minnesota school systems. The committee will use these data to better serve the parent committee and the State Board of Education. Hopefully, these data will also assist other agencies serving Minnesota schools to find ways to improve the quality and effectiveness of their services.

The heart of the report is, of course, the tables which contain the data from the questionnaire responses. In many instances, these data could have been analyzed in somewhat different ways to show or emphasize different relationships. Numerous arbitrary decisions have been made in attempting to present the data in forms which the writer belives to be of most use and interest to Minnesota educators. Persons interested in further analyses or different breakdowns on these data are urged to contact the project director.

The text summarizes the information from the tables and calls attention to findings, patterns, and relationships which I believe to be of particular interest or significance. In some cases the interpretations may go beyond the data. I make no apologies for these for I believe that is part of the task of the reporter, but the reader should be alert for biases and feel free to impose his own.

Edwin Gary Joselyn

Acknowledgments

This study was conceived by the Testing Subcommittee of the State Advisory Committee on Guidance and Pupil Personnel Services under the leadership of its chairman, Dr. Paul Ingwell. The committee was encouraged to proceed with the study by the Pupil Personnel Services Section of the State Department of Education and its director, Reynold Erickson. Julius Karlan of the State Department staff cooperated in facilitating the work of the committee and helped keep it focused on its objectives. His assistance with this project has been considerable. The questionnaire return of over 95 per cent testifies to the outstanding cooperation which the committee and the project director received from Minnesota educators. It is our hope that the results of the study will compensate each person who helped to make it a success.

Most of the ideas and planning, for this study came from the testing subcommittee and the project director. However, a good deal of the content was inspired by three other studies, some resembling this effort more than others.

Numerous items and the general format of the questionnaire booklet were taken from the Russell Sage Foundation studies of the Social Consequences of Ability Testing (Brim, Neulinger, & Glass, 1965; Goslin, Epstein, & Hallock, 1965; Brim, Goslin, Glass, & Goldberg, 1965).

A second important source of content for the questionnaire was the research on the use of tests results by Hastings and others at Illinois (Hastings, Runkel, & Damrin, 1961; Runkel, Hastings, & Damrin, 1961; Hastings, Runkel, Damrin, Kane, & Larson, 1960).

Readers familiar with Womer's two studies of testing programs in Michigan schools will recognize many items and notice that the general format of the tables are patterned after his (Womer, 1959; Womer, 1963).

Many at the Student Counseling Bureau have contributed much to the completion of this study and thanks are due to all. The most deserving include: Dr. Ralph Berdie and his successor, Dr. Arthur Smith, Directors of the Counseling Bureau and the State-Wide Testing Programs, who gave much encouragement

and allowed a good deal of time away from other pressing duties; Ken Fisher, who edited the questionnaires for punching; Mrs. Veronica Schultz and her fine crew, who by hand and by computer spewed out the thousands of numbers; Diana Suslak, who efficiently "debugged" the data and tallied the unpunched responses; Beverly Lilleg, "table-typer," and Kristen Anderson, who typed most of the text and prepared the hundreds of tables; and June Stein, who read and reread the manuscript.

E. G. J.

Minneapolis, Minnesota
November, 1967

References

Brim, O. G., Neulinger, J., and Glass, D. C., *Experiences and Attitudes of American Adults Concerning Standardized Intelligence Tests*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1965

Brim, O. G. Jr., Goslin, D. A., Glass, D. C. and Goldberg, I., *The Use of Standardized Ability Tests in American Secondary Schools and Their Impact on Students, Teachers, and Administrators*. New Yerk: Russell Sage Foundation, 1965

Goslin, D. A., Epstein, Roberta R., and Hallock, Barbara., *The Use of Standardized Tests in Elementary Schools*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1965

Hastings, J. T., Runkel, P. J., and Damrin, E. E., *Effects on Use of Tests by Teachers Trained in a Summer Institute*. Urbana: University of Illinois, Bureau of Educational Research, 1961

Hastings, J. T., Runkel, P. J., Damrin, Doug E., Kune, R. B., Larson, G. L., *The Use of Test Results*. Urbana: University of Illinois, Bureau of Educational Research, 1960

Runkel, P. J., Hastings, J. T., and Damrin, D. E., *Changes in Schools Which Do and Do Not Send Staff Members to Training Institutes in Counseling*. Urbana: University of Illinois, Bureau of Educational Research, 1961

Womer, F. B., *Testing Programs in Michigan Schools*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1959

Womer, F. B., *Testing Programs in Michigan Schools 1963*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1963

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Preface III

Introduction IV

Acknowledgements VI

References VIII

List of Tables X

Chapter 1 Description of Study and Questionnaire Returns 1

Chapter 2 General School Practices Relating to Testing 9

Chapter 3 Tests Used in Minnesota Schools 21

Chapter 4 Practices Relating to the Administration of Standardized Tests 43

Chapter 5 Reporting, Interpretation, and Use of Test Results 61

Chapter 6 High School Testing Programs 97

Chapter 7 Planning for Change 113

Chapter 8 Possibilities for Improvement 135

Chapter 9 Summary 149

Appendix I School Systems Returning Questionnaire by Size of System 151

Appendix II School Buildings 157

Appendix III Professional Staff 159

Appendix IV Kindergartens 167

Appendix V Effect of PTA on Testing Programs 169

Appendix VI Ability Grouping 173

Appendix VII Information Maintained in Pupil Records 177

Appendix VIII Practices in Reporting Pupil Progress to Parents ... 181

Appendix IX Assignment of the High School Principal to Counseling and Guidance 187

Appendix X High School Remedial and Developmental Reading Programs 189

Appendix XI High School "Guidance" and "Occupational" Units .. 195

Appendix XII How Users First Heard of Their Tests 199

Appendix XIII Requirements for Reimbursement for Guidance, Counseling, and Testing Under Title V-A, NDEA, 1965-66 203

Appendix XIV Minnesota High School State-Wide Testing Program, 1965-66 205

Appendix XV Elementary Questionnaire

Appendix XVI Secondary Questionnaire

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Chapter 1

1- 1 Questionnaire Returns 4

1- 2 ELEMENTARY—Who Filled Out the Questionnaire....... 6

1- 3 SECONDARY—Who Filled Out the Questionnaire......... 7

Chapter 2

2- 1 ELEMENTARY—Person or Group Responsible for Testing Program 10

2- 2 SECONDARY—Person or Group Responsible for Testing Program 11

2- 3 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY—Testing Committees 12

2- 4 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY—School District Testing Committees 13

2- 5 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY—Secondary Involvement in the Elementary Testing Program and Vice Versa.. 14

2- 6 ELEMENTARY—Visits by Consultants........ 15

2- 7 SECONDARY—Visits by Consultants........ 16

2- 8 ELEMENTARY—Providing Teachers with Test Results... 18

2- 9 SECONDARY—Providing Teachers with Test Results..... 19

2-10 ELEMENTARY—Faculty Meetings Dealing with Test Results 20

2-11 SECONDARY—Faculty Meetings Dealing with Test Results 20

Chapter 3

3- 1 ELEMENTARY—Group Intelligence or Scholastic Aptitude Tests 22

3- 2 SECONDARY—Group Intelligence or Scholastic Aptitude Tests 22

3- 3 ELEMENTARY—Group Intelligence or Scholastic Aptitude Tests 24

3- 4 SECONDARY—Group Intelligence or Scholastic Aptitude Tests 25

3- 5 ELEMENTARY—Individual Intelligence Tests........ 26

3- 6 SECONDARY—Individual Intelligence Tests........ 27

3- 7 ELEMENTARY—Individual Intelligence Tests........ 27

3- 8 SECONDARY—Individual Intelligence Tests........ 29

3- 9 SECONDARY—Multi-Aptitude Batteries 29

3-10 SECONDARY—Multi-Aptitude Batteries 30

3-11 ELEMENTARY—Achievement Batteries 30

3-12 SECONDARY—Achievement Batteries 31

3-13 ELEMENTARY—Achievement Batteries 32

Page
3-14 SECONDARY—Achievement Batteries 33
3-15 ELEMENTARY—Reading Readiness Tests................ 34
3-16 ELEMENTARY—Reading Readiness Tests................ 34
3-17 ELEMENTARY—Reading Tests 36
3-18 SECONDARY—Reading Tests 36
3-19 ELEMENTARY—Reading Tests 37
3-20 SECONDARY—Reading Tests 38
3-21 SECONDARY—Interest Inventories 39
3-22 SECONDARY—Interest Inventories 40
3-23 SECONDARY—Personality Tests 42
3-24 SECONDARY—Personality Tests 42

Chapter 4

4- 1 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY—Proportion of Pupils Taking Tests 45
4- 2 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY—Number of Times Tests are Given 48
4- 3 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY—Time of School Year for Administration of Tests.......................... 50
4- 4 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Who Administers Standardized Tests 53
4- 5 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY—Who Scores Standardized Tests 56
4- 6 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY—Who Records Standardized Tests 59

Chapter 5

5- 1 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Types of Test Scores 62
5- 2 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY—Norm Groups Available 66
5- 3 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Reporting Test Scores to Children 69
5- 4 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Reporting of Test Scores to Parents.................................. 73
5- 5 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY—Who Interprets Test Results 77
5- 6 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Availability of Scores to Teachers................................. 81
5- 7 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY—Use of Test Results 87
5- 8 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY—Single Most Important Use for Test Results............................. 92
5- 9 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY—Amount of Reliance Placed on Test Results.............................. 95

Page

Chapter 6

6- 1 SECONDARY—Participation in the National Defense Education Act, Title V-A 98

6- 2 SECONDARY—Subject-Matter Aptitude Tests 99

6- 3 SECONDARY—Subject-Matter Aptitude Tests 99

6- 4 SECONDARY—Subject-Matter Achievement Tests 100

6- 5 SECONDARY—Subject-Matter Achievement Tests 101

6- 6 SECONDARY—External Testing, 1965-66 101

6- 7 SECONDARY—External Testing, American College Testing Program (ACT) 103

6- 8 SECONDARY—External Testing, College Entrance Examination Boards (CEEB) 104

6- 9 SECONDARY—External Testing, Minnesota Mathematics Test (MMT) 105

6-10 SECONDARY—External Testing, National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test (NMSQT) 106

6-11 SECONDARY—External Testing, Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT), Grade 11 107

6-12 SECONDARY—External Testing, Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT), Grade 12 108

6-13 SECONDARY—External Testing, General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB) 109

6-14 SECONDARY—External Testing, Airman Qualifying Test (AQT) 110

6-15 SECONDARY—Testing Costs Paid by Students 111

6-16 SECONDARY—Tests for Which Students Pay Costs 111

Chapter 7

7- 1 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY—Planning for Change 113

7- 2 ELEMENTARY—Anticipated Changes in Testing Program 115

7- 3 SECONDARY—Anticipated Changes in Testing Program .. 127

Chapter 8

8- 1 ELEMENTARY—Reactions to Suggestions for Improvements in Use of Test Results 136

8- 2 SECONDARY—Reactions to Suggestions for Improvements in Use of Test Results 140

8- 3 ELEMENTARY—Most and Least Preferred Suggestions ... 145

8- 4 SECONDARY—Most and Least Preferred Suggestions 147

Appendix II

II-1 ELEMENTARY—Elementary School Buildings 157

II-2 SECONDARY—Percentages of School Districts Operating Various Numbers of Junior (Jr.), Senior (Sr.), and Junior-Senior (Jr.-Sr.) High School Buildings 158

Page

Appendix III

III-1 ELEMENTARY—Persons Assigned as Elementary School Counselors 160
III-2 SECONDARY—Persons Assigned as Guidance Counselors.. 161
III-3 ELEMENTARY—Persons Assigned as School Psychologists 162
III-4 SECONDARY—Persons Assigned as School Psychologists.. 163
III-5 ELEMENTARY—Persons Assigned as Social Workers..... 164
III-6 SECONDARY—Persons Assigned as Social Workers....... 165

Appendix IV

IV-1 ELEMENTARY—Kindergarten 167

Appendix V

V-1 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY—Activity of PTA... 170
V-2 ELEMENTARY—Effect of PTA on Testing Program...... 171
V-3 SECONDARY—Effect of PTA on Testing Program........ 172

Appendix VI

VI-1 ELEMENTARY—Ability Grouping in Assignment to Classroom 173
VI-2 SECONDARY—Ability Grouping in Assignment to Classroom 174
VI-3 ELEMENTARY—Ability Grouping Within Classroom..... 175
VI-4 SECONDARY—Ability Grouping Within the Classroom.... 176

Appendix VII

VII-1 ELEMENTARY—Information in Cumulative Records...... 178
VII-2 SECONDARY—Information in Cumulative Records........ 179

Appendix VIII

VIII-1 ELEMENTARY—Method of Reporting to Parents......... 182
VIII-2 SECONDARY—Method of Reporting to Parents, Junior High 182
VIII-3 SECONDARY—Method of Reporting to Parents, Senior High 183
VIII-4 ELEMENTARY—Reports to Parents.................... 184
VIII-5 SECONDARY—Reports to Parents...................... 185
VIII-6 ELEMENTARY—Parents Told Pupil's Aptitude for Learning 186
VIII-7 SECONDARY—Parents Told Pupil's Aptitude for Learning 186

Appendix IX

IX-1 SECONDARY—Principal Assigned to Guidance and Counseling 187

Page

Appendix X

X-1 SECONDARY—Persons Assigned as Remedial Reading Teachers 190

X-2 SECONDARY—Developmental Reading Course 191

X-3 SECONDARY—Grade Placement of Developmental Reading Units 191

X-4 SECONDARY—Length of Developmental Reading Units... 192

X-5 SECONDARY—Proportion of Pupils Included in Developmental Reading Units 193

X-6 SECONDARY—Use of Test Scores in Developmental Reading Unit 193

Appendix XI

XI-1 SECONDARY—Guidance or Occupational Units 195

XI-2 SECONDARY—Grade Placement of Guidance Units 196

XI-3 SECONDARY—Length of Guidance Units 197

XI-4 SECONDARY—Use of Test Scores in Guidance Unit...... 197

Appendix XII

XII-1 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY—How Users First Heard of Their Tests 200

* * *

Chapter 1

Description of the Study and Questionnaire Returns

This chapter describes the development and distribution of the questionnaire, the returns, and the tables in the body of the report.

The Questionnaire

Two questionnaires were prepared, one for elementary, grades K-6, and one for secondary, grades 7-12. They were designed to be as similar as possible including only the differences necessary to make them appropriate for use at the separate levels. Rough drafts of the questionnaires were prepared by the Project Director using the sources cited in the introduction and suggestions of the staff of the Minnesota State-Wide Testing Programs, the Guidance Section of the State Department of Education, and the Testing Subcommittee of the State Advisory Committee on Guidance, Counseling, and Testing.

After editing by the Subcommittee, the questionnaires were tried out in approximately fifteen elementary and secondary schools of various sizes from various parts of the State and these preliminary tryouts resulted in further changes. The final questionnaires are found in Appendices XV and XVI.

The questionnaires were mailed to schools on March 15, 1966. One elementary and one secondary questionnaire were sent to each Minnesota public school district which graduates seniors. Private schools and elementary districts not holding school through the twelfth grade were not included. School districts operating more than one elementary or secondary building were asked to complete the questionnaire for a "typical" building. An item in the questionnaire asked these schools to indicate whether or not the testing program was essentially the same in each building and virtually every school district indicated it was.

A reminder post card was sent one week after the questionnaires were mailed. The initial mailing and the follow-up post card produced a return of 75 per cent, quite high for initial mailings of survey-type materials. Two follow-up letters, one a "personal" letter, were sent some weeks later. Finally, phone calls were made to schools that still had not returned questionnaires by late spring. These efforts resulted in an over-all return of 95 per cent of the elementary questionnaires and 96 per cent of the secondary questionnaires.

Classification of Schools

For purposes of analysis, school districts were classified into five arbitrary categories as follows:

Schools with 0-35 students per grade.
Schools with 36-99 students per grade.
Schools with 100 or more students per grade.
Suburban
Urban

Schools were classified as "Urban" and "Suburban" without reference to class size. The urban school districts are Duluth, Minneapolis, and St. Paul. The suburban schools are twenty-six districts surrounding the Twin Cities usually considered part of the metropolitan area. Classification of schools as "suburban" was arbitrary and others might be inclined to make additions or deletions to this list.* The names of the school districts in each category that returned questionnaires are listed in Appendix I.

The data on class size were obtained from records of the Minnesota College State-Wide Testing Program. Specifically, districts were placed in one of the first three categories according to the number of juniors tested in the Minnesota College State-Wide Testing Program in 1963-64. Two difficulties with this procedure should be mentioned. First, the class sizes are based on the 1963-64 school year whereas the study was conducted during the 1965-66 school year. Population changes certainly would have changed the classification of a few schools had more recent data been available. Second, the size of the junior class is not always representative of the size of elementary classes, particularly in districts which have a large number of students attending parochial or other private schools. Even so, these data approximate very closely the sizes of the 1965 graduating classes.

---

*Brooklyn Center, Burnsville, Circle Pines, Inver Grove-Pine Bend, and Orono should have been included in the suburban category.

A Word About the Tables

Most of the tables in this report show questionnaire responses in terms of per cent of school districts responding in each of the five categories of school size and for the total group. Numbers are omitted but can be obtained by writing to the author or computed using the base numbers contained in Table 1-1. Per cents have been rounded to the nearest whole per cent so occasionally columns do not total to 100 because of rounding error.

It is important to remember, then, that the per cents presented in the Urban Category are based on only three school systems, and in the Suburban Category the per cents are based on a total of 26 systems.

Questionnaire Returns

Table 1-1 shows the number and per cent of schools returning questionnaires by category and total group. Larger school systems returned more of their questionnaires and the secondary schools returned more than the elementary schools. The bottom line in the table shows the per cent of the total Minnesota public school population enrolled in schools returning questionnaires. These data, too, are based on the 1963-64 State-Wide College Testing Program.

Who Filled Out the Questionnaire

Tables 1-2 and 1-3 show the per cent of people with various titles completing the questionnaire. The general instructions (Appendix XVII) asked:

> The person or persons who have primary responsibility for the conduct of the testing program at each level should complete the two questionnaires. This may be a counselor or a guidance director, or the principal or superintendent in systems having no counselor. It is important that the person who bears primary responsibility for the ongoing operation of the testing program at each level be the one to complete the questionnaire.

In the smaller school systems the superintendent or principal usually completed the questionnaire with more specialized per-

TABLE 1-1

Questionnaire Returns

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF SCHOOLS RETURNING QUESTIONNAIRE BY CATEGORY AND TOTAL GROUP, ELEMENTARY (E) AND SECONDARY (S)

	SIZE OF SCHOOL SYSTEM										TOTAL	
	Class Size 1–35		Class Size 36–99		Class Size 100 and over		Suburban		Urban			
	E	S	E	S	E	S	E	S	E	S	E	S
Number of Schools in Category	136	136	195	195	92	92	26	26	3	3	452	452
Number Responding	124	128	187	187	90	92	26	25	3	3	430	435
Per Cent Responding	91.2	94.1	95.9	95.9	97.8	100	100	96.2	100	100	95.1	96.2
Per Cent of Public School Pupils Attending Responding Schools	92.1	95.0	96.1	96.2	98.5	100	100	98.4	100	100	98.1	98.5

sonnel taking over in the larger systems. Except in the smaller schools the counselor or director of pupil personnel services completed most of the secondary questionnaires. The 35 per cent of "others" completing elementary questionnaires from suburban schools is represented by titles such as "Assistant Principal," "Assistant Director of Elementary Education," "Assistant Superintendent," "Director of Guidance," and "Director of Pupil Personnel." That there are many more females in counseling and administrative positions at the elementary level is clearly shown by the data on sex of respondents shown at the bottom of the tables.

TABLE 1-2

ELEMENTARY — Who Filled Out the Questionnaire

TITLE	Percentages of persons with each title completing questionnaire.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Teacher	4	1	—	—	—	2
Principal	68	83	46	15	—	66
Curriculum director	—	—	—	8	—	1
Director of elementary education	—	3	46	31	—	13
Superintendent	24	6	—	—	—	10
Elementary school counselor	—	1	1	—	—	1
High school guidance director (counselor)	2	5	1	—	—	3
Psychologist	—	—	1	12	33	1
Other	1	—	3	35	67	3
No Response	1	1	1	—	—	1

SEX	Percentages of persons of each sex completing the questionnaire.					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	Total
Male	41	56	73	92	67	57
Female	57	40	25	4	33	40
No Response	2	4	2	4	—	3

TABLE 1-3

SECONDARY — Who Filled Out the Questionnaire

TITLE	Percentages of persons with each title completing questionnaire.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Teacher	1	3	—	—	—	1
Principal	80	48	10	4	—	47
Curriculum director	—	—	—	—	—	—
Director of secondary education	—	—	1	4	—	1
Superintendent	12	3	1	—	—	5
Pupil personnel administrator (Director of Special Services)	—	—	1	16	33	1
Guidance director or counselor	6	46	85	64	67	44
Psychologist	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other	1	1	2	12	—	2

SEX	Percentages of persons of each sex completing questionnaire.					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	Total
Male	98	94	91	84	100	94
Female	2	4	9	12	—	5
No Response	1	2	—	4	—	2

Chapter 2

General School Practices Relating to Testing

From the beginning, the committee intended that this study go beyond simply finding out what tests are given in Minnesota schools. This chapter presents data about the development of school testing programs, the persons responsible for their development, and school practices and policies which may be related to school testing programs.

Development of the Testing Program

The respondents were asked to indicate the one person or persons having primary responsibility for the development of the school testing program. The replies to this question are summarized in Tables 2-1 and 2-2. Principals bear heavy responsibility for the testing programs in Minnesota schools, particularly in the smaller schools and at the elementary level. Superintendents are more apt to retain control of the testing programs in the small elementary schools than in the small secondary schools —26 per cent of the smallest districts report that the elementary principal has primary responsibility for the testing program, whereas 63 per cent of the secondary principals of schools in this category have similar responsibilities.

The major difference between elementary and secondary on this item is the presence of guidance counselors in the high schools where 43 per cent have assigned primary responsibility for the development of the testing program to the counselor. This figure is as high as 85 per cent in the larger school systems.

Testing Committees

Most "experts" on school testing, such as consultants, text book authors, and test publishers, feel that school testing programs should be set up and continuously evaluated by a testing committee composed of professional staff persons from various

TABLE 2-1

ELEMENTARY — Person or Group Responsible for Testing Program

Who is the one person(s) bearing primary responsibility for the development of your testing program as it now exists?	Percentages of school systems reporting various persons or groups as having primary responsibility for the testing program.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Testing committee	—	—	2	3	33	1
Classroom teacher(s)	15	5	—	—	—	7
Principal(s)	26	54	38	8	—	40
Superintendent or assistant superintendent	33	16	2	8	—	18
Director of elementary education or elementary supervisor	1	3	42	46	—	13
Curriculum director	—	—	—	3	33	1
Counselor or other pupil personnel specialist	2	3	6	3	—	3
Consultant(s) from colleges or universities	—	—	—	—	—	—
Consultant(s) from State Department of Education	—	1	—	—	—	1
Consultant(s) from commercial test publishers	—	—	—	—	—	—
Salesman from commercial test publisher	—	—	—	—	—	—
Reading specialist	1	1	—	—	—	1
School psychologist	—	—	2	15	—	1
Can't really say who was responsible for its development; it has been this way for a long time	2	3	—	—	—	2
Other	—	—	1	8	33	1
No Response	21	15	8	3	—	14

TABLE 2-2

SECONDARY — Person or Group Responsible for Testing Program

Who is the one person(s) bearing primary responsibility for the development of your testing program as it now exists?	Percentages of school systems reporting various persons or groups as having primary responsibility for the testing program.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Testing committee	2	1	—	4	33	1
Classroom teacher(s)	2	2	—	—	—	1
Principal(s)	63	38	10	4	—	37
Superintendent or assistant superintendent	22	9	2	—	—	11
Director of secondary education or secondary supervisor	—	—	1	—	—	1
Curriculum director	—	—	—	—	—	—
Counselor or other pupil personnel specialist	8	41	85	84	33	43
Consultants from colleges or universities	1	1	—	—	—	1
Consultant(s) from State Department of Education	1	1	—	—	—	1
Consultant(s) from commercial test publishers	—	—	—	—	—	—
Salesman from commercial test publisher	—	—	—	—	—	—
Can't really say who was responible for its development; it has been this way for a long time	—	3	—	—	—	1
Other	—	—	1	8	33	1
No Response	2	6	1	—	—	4

backgrounds. Yet it is obvious from Tables 2-3 and 2-4 that few Minnesota schools follow the experts on this point. One-fourth of the elementary schools say they have their own testing committee while less than one-fifth of the elementary schools report such a committee. Elementary schools of the larger systems are more apt to have a testing committee but this does not seem to be a function of school size at the secondary level. Table 2-4 reports the answers to the question asking if the school *district* has a testing committee covering kindergarten through the twelfth grade—the situation considered most ideal by the experts. Twelve per cent of the elementary schools and six per cent of the secondary report the existence of such committee. It is interesting that elementary people are more likely to believe their district has a testing committee than are their high school colleagues. Similar perceptions and clearer communications should have resulted in identical elementary and secondary responses on this item.

In another attempt to assess the amount of cooperation between the elementary and secondary school levels in the development of the testing programs, schools were asked to indicate whether or not personnel from the other level were

TABLE 2-3

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Testing Committees

Do you have an elementary (secondary) school testing committee which operates independently from the high school (elementary)?	Percentages of school systems with elementary or secondary level testing committees.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
ELEMENTARY						
Yes	23	20	37	42	33	26
No Response	2	1	2	—	—	1
SECONDARY						
Yes	15	18	16	16	33	17
No Response	1	1	1	—	—	1

TABLE 2-4

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — School District Testing Committees

Does your district (K-12) have an active testing committee?	Percentages of school systems reporting district testing committees.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
ELEMENTARY						
Yes	10	9	19	8	33	12
No Response	1	2	—	4	—	1
SECONDARY						
Yes	7	4	8	4	67	6
No Response	—	1	—	—	—	*

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

involved in the development of their own program. Almost a third of the elementary respondents say that secondary level personnel participated in development of the testing program while 16 per cent of the secondary respondents say elementary personnel worked with them. (Table 2-5). Apparently the larger, out-state systems do the best job of establishing communications between levels. The trend for more cooperation as school systems become larger is reversed in the suburban school category where only one system reports that elementary level personnel were involved in the development of the secondary level testing program. Secondary personnel are less likely to arrange for participation of the elementary personnel in their testing program deliberations than vice versa.

Visits by Consultants

Consultants and other visitors from outside agencies sometimes provide assistance to schools in the development of their testing programs. The four main sources of visitors are the State Department of Education, colleges and the University, the Minnesota State-Wide Testing Programs, and commercial test publishers. The intent of this item was to inquire about visits from persons who could provide help with the testing program. Table 2-6 shows that elementary schools receive few calls from persons qualified to assist them with the testing program. The category, "other consultants from the State Department of Education," is doubtless the elementary consultants, knowledgeable in the field of elementary education, but without particular skills in standardized testing.

There is considerably more outside consultation with high schools where almost one-third remember visits by personnel from the Guidance Section of the State Department of Education and from the Minnesota State-Wide Testing Programs. Both of these agencies employ personnel who have primary responsibilities for consultation with schools, yet the coverage is still quite inadequate and Table 2-7 shows that two-thirds of the schools remain unvisited in a three-year period.

Visitors to Minnesota schools are more likely to go to the larger schools. This is particularly true in the case of salesmen

TABLE 2-5

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Secondary Involvement in the Elementary Testing Program and Vice Versa

Have personnel from the secondary (elementary) level (other than the superindentent) participated in the development of the elementary (secondary) school testing program?	Percentages of school systems reporting participation of personnel from the other level in development of the elementary or secondary testing program.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
ELEMENTARY						
Yes	19	28	43	35	67	29
No Response	2	2	1	—	—	2
SECONDARY						
Yes	17	16	19	4	33	16
No Response	1	—	—	—	—	1

from commercial test publishers who naturally tend to concentrate their greatest efforts in situations where the financial returns may be larger.

These tables must be interpreted with caution since they probably underestimate considerably the amount of contact between the schools and these agencies. Certainly a number of schools received visits in past years which were unknown to the person completing the questionnaire. The questions cover only visits to the school by persons from the agencies and do not reflect the hundreds of visits by school personnel to the agencies' offices. Finally, there is considerable contact by telephone and written correspondence which is not shown here.

TABLE 2-6

ELEMENTARY — Visits by Consultants

Within this and the past two years, has your school been visited by any of the following? (Per cent answering "yes")	Percentages of school systems reporting visits by outside consultants.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Guidance consultant from the State Department of Education (Reynold Erickson, Julius Kerlan, Dean Miller)....	10	8	7	19	33	9
Consultant from the State-Wide Testing Programs, Student Counseling Bureau, University of Minnesota (Gary Joselyn)................	10	9	4	8	—	8
Other consultant from the State Department of Education......	13	19	31	35	—	21
Other guidance or counseling consultant from any Minnesota college or university...........	2	3	4	4	—	3
Consultant from commercial test publisher.....................	7	14	21	62	67	17
Other consultant................	2	6	2	4	33	4
No Response..................	2	6	4	4	—	3

Providing Teachers with Test Results

Methods of giving teachers test results vary considerably according to size of school system and from elementary to secondary as shown in Tables 2-8 and 2-9. Test results are apt to be kept in the teacher's room at the elementary level, but secondary schools seldom send test results directly to teachers. Test results are more often kept in the central offices in the smaller systems.

The second choice for this item was an attempt to determine the availability of other professional staff to work with teachers in the interpretation of test results. Elementary teachers are more on their own in the interpretation of test results than teachers at the secondary level where 43 per cent of the secondary schools say the teacher may look up the test results, "in consultation with the principal or guidance counselor." Not one Minnesota school reported that the test results were completely

TABLE 2-7

SECONDARY — Visits by Consultants

Within this and the past two years has your school been visited by any of the following? (Per cent answering "yes")	Percentages of school systems reporting visits by outside consultants.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Guidance consultant from the State Department of Education (Reynold Erickson, Julius Kerlan, Dean Miller)	20	28	46	56	—	31
Consultant from the State-Wide Testing Programs, Student Counseling Bureau, University of Minnesota (Gary Joselyn)	30	32	55	36	—	36
Other guidance or counseling consultant from any Minnesota college or university	8	5	11	16	—	8
Consultant from commercial test publisher	13	11	38	40	33	19
Other consultant	5	8	9	12	—	7
No Response	1	1	1	—	—	1

confidential and not available to teachers. This will interest many readers who will be able to remember not many years ago when some principals (and even some counselors) kept test results locked in their personal files and refused to allow teachers to see them for fear they would be misused.

One rather common method of teaching teachers about test results is through general faculty meetings. Tables 2-10 and 2-11 show the frequency of general faculty meetings called for the purpose of discussing and interpreting test results. At the elementary level there are markedly fewer of these faculty meetings in the smaller school systems while almost all of the larger systems have at least one meeting. Size of school system seems to have little influence on the frequency of meetings at the secondary level, however.

While almost one-half of the suburban high schools do not hold even one faculty meeting a year to discuss test results, all but one of the suburban elementary schools report at least one such meeting each year.

TABLE 2-8

ELEMENTARY — Providing Teachers with Test Results

In general, how do your teachers learn of students' test scores once they are available in the school building?	Percentages of school systems reporting various methods of informing teachers of test results.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Test results are placed in the files in the central office and any teacher who wishes may look them up	44	16	18	4	—	23
Test results are placed in the files in the principal's office or in the guidance counselor's office and any teacher who wishes may learn of them in consultation with the principal or guidance counselor	16	22	9	8	—	16
Test results are sent directly to each teacher who keeps them in his own files	39	61	71	88	100	59
Test results are completely confidential and are not available to teachers	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other	2	2	2	—	—	2

TABLE 2-9

SECONDARY — Providing Teachers with Test Results

In general, how do your teachers learn of students' test scores once they are available in the school building?	Percentages of school systems reporting various methods of informing teachers of test results.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Test results are placed in the files in the central office and any teacher who wishes may look them up	45	38	33	24	33	38
Test results are placed in the files in the principal's office or in the guidance counselor's office and any teacher who wishes may learn of them in consultation with the principal or guidance counselor	48	43	36	40	33	43
Test results are sent directly to each teacher who keeps them in his file	6	16	29	32	33	17
Test results are completely confidential and are not available to teachers	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other	2	3	2	4	—	2

TABLE 2-10

ELEMENTARY — Faculty Meetings Dealing with Test Results

How many general faculty meetings would you say are usually held each year for the primary purpose of discussing and interpreting test results?	Percentages of school systems reporting various numbers of faculty meetings for test interpretation					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
None	40	22	7	4	—	23
One	25	35	40	38	33	33
Two	23	35	46	27	33	30
Three	10	4	10	19	33	8
Four or more	2	3	6	12	—	4
No Response	1	2	1	—	—	1

TABLE 2-11

SECONDARY — Faculty Meetings Dealing with Test Results

How many general faculty meetings would you say are usually held each year for the primary purpose of discussing and interpreting test results?	Percentages of school systems reporting various numbers of faculty meetings for test interpretation.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
None	30	35	35	48	—	34
One	36	35	46	32	100	38
Two	23	20	12	16	—	19
Three	7	5	4	4	—	6
Four or more	3	3	1	—	—	2
No Response	—	1	1	—	—	1

Chapter 3

Tests Used in Minnesota Schools

This chapter tabulates the standardized tests used in Minnesota schools by the four major types: Scholastic Aptitude, Achievement, Interest, and Personality. We are here concerned only with standardized tests which are part of the every-pupil standardized testing program. Therefore, this chapter does not include information on teacher-made tests, tests which are considered part of the instructional materials of various curricula, or specific subject-matter achievement or aptitude tests. The use of the latter in high schools is covered in Chapter 6. Tests which may be administered to only a small number of select student for diagnostic, counseling or similar purposes are likewise not discussed here.

Scholastic Aptitude (Intelligence) Tests

The proportion of schools using general intelligence or scholastic aptitude tests at the various grade levels is shown in Tables 3-1 and 3-2. At the elementary level there is substantially more scholastic aptitude testing in the odd numbered years than in the even numbered years. An exception is the suburban category where one-half of the districts use a scholastic aptitude test in the second grade. There is a tendency for the larger school systems to do more scholastic aptitude testing than the smaller systems in the elementary grades.

The emphasis on scholastic aptitude testing in odd numbered years continues at the secondary level with 76 per cent of the schools administering a scholastic aptitude test at the seventh grade. If one considers multi-aptitude batteries to be special cases of scholastic aptitude tests, this pattern continues at ninth grade with 60 per cent of the schools using multi-aptitude batteries at that grade (Table 3-9) in addition to 33 per cent giving a group intelligence test.

These tables do not include the scholastic aptitude test given through the Minnesota State-Wide College Testing Program

TABLE 3-1
ELEMENTARY—Group Intelligence or Scholastic Aptitude Tests

Grades in Which Administered	Percentages of school systems administering group intelligence or scholastic aptitude tests in various grades.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Pre-School	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kindergarten	5	8	8	—	—	6
1st Grade	52	60	57	42	—	56
2nd Grade	23	26	26	50	—	26
3rd Grade	50	63	62	54	33	58
4th Grade	34	33	33	46	100	35
5th Grade	46	53	63	62	67	54
6th Grade	30	30	28	42	33	30

TABLE 3-2
SECONDARY — Group Intelligence or Scholastic Aptitude Tests

Grades in Which Administered	Percentages of school systems administering group intelligence or scholastic aptitude tests in various grades.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
7th Grade	79	71	82	84	67	76
8th Grade	37	34	33	32	—	34
9th Grade	36	32	31	28	—	33
10th Grade	18	18	40	60	33	25
11th Grade	14	14	18	20	—	15
12th Grade	7	8	10	12	—	8

at the eleventh grade level. The test currently used in this program, sponsored by the Association of Minnesota Colleges, is the Minnesota Scholastic Aptitude Test (MSAT), a short form of the Ohio Psychological Examination. Virtually every Minnesota junior takes the MSAT each winter so that pattern of scholasic aptitude testing in odd numbered years continues through all thirteen years.

There is little difference in the frequency of use of tests of scholastic aptitude in the various sized systems with the exception of the tenth grade where the large out-state and suburban schools are much more apt to administer a scholastic aptitude test than the small schools.

Tables 3-3 and 3-4 show the frequency of use of different tests of scholastic aptitude.* The Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Tests (LTIT) is by far the most popular test of this kind at both elementary and secondary levels. The high incidence of use of LTIT in high school is undoubtedly influenced by its inclusion in the Minnesota High School State-Wide Testing Program. The reason for the high popularity of the test in the elementary grades is not so clear, but it is possible that the high use at the secondary level is an influence. The Kuhlmann-Anderson Intelligence Tests, the Kuhlmann-Finch Tests, and the Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Tests are still used in a number of Minnesota elementary schools. At the secondary level the Otis is the only test with any appreciable amount of use other than LTIT.

Individual Intelligence Tests

Individual intelligence tests, tests administered in a one-to-one relationship by a trained clinician, are special cases of standardized tests which are of interest to educators. In fact, the original Stanford-Binet scale was the forerunner of all standardized ability testing, both individual and group.

Tables 3-5 and 3-6 show that between 15 and 20 per cent of Minnesota school systems administer individual intelligence tests at almost every grade level. These tables show only the per cent of schools giving any individual intelligence tests and are not

---

*The column percentages in these and similar tables following may sometimes total more than 100 because some schools give two or more different scholastic aptitude tests during the six elementary or the six high school years.

TABLE 3-3

ELEMENTARY—Group Intelligence or Scholastic Aptitude Tests

TEST	Percentages of school systems administering different group intelligence or scholastic aptitude tests.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
California Test of Mental Maturity	5	6	3	4	—	5
Cooperative School and College Ability Tests	—	—	—	4	—	*
Henmon-Nelson Tests of Mental Ability	2	5	—	4	—	3
Kuhlmann-Anderson Intelligence Tests	16	15	16	12	—	15
Kuhlmann-Finch Tests	19	13	11	4	—	14
Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Tests	43	42	55	77	33	48
Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Tests	7	23	28	15	—	19
SRA Tests of Educational Ability	2	3	3	4	—	3
Other	—	1	—	—	—	1

* Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 3-4

SECONDARY — Group Intelligence or Scholastic Aptitude Tests

TEST	Percentages of school systems administering different group intelligence or scholastic aptitude tests.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
ACE Psychological Examination..	5	4	4	4	—	4
California Test of Mental Maturity....................	2	1	—	4	—	1
Cooperative School and College Ability Tests.................	—	1	2	4	—	1
Henmon-Nelson Tests of Mental Ability................	4	4	7	—	—	4
Kuhlmann-Anderson Intelligence Tests.........................	5	5	2	4	—	4
Kuhlmann-Finch Tests..........	8	9	3	4	—	7
Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Tests.........................	89	77	89	92	67	84
Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Tests.................	8	15	34	28	—	17
SRA Tests of Educational Ability.......................	4	4	1	—	—	3
Other..........................	1	4	1	—	—	2

a good indication of the absolute number of Minnesota students who take them. It is generally not feasible to administer an individual intelligence test to every pupil and responses to the question asking what proportion of students take various tests (Table 4-1) show that individual intelligence tests are usually given only to small numbers of selected students.

There is considerable variation in individual intelligence testing according to school size. This is undoubtedly a function of the availability of clinicians with sufficient training to administer these kinds of instruments.

Notice that the larger school systems administer more individual intelligence tests at the secondary level than in elementary.

The percentages of schools using each of the particular individual intelligence tests is shown in Tables 3-7 and 3-8. The Stanford-Binet and the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children are about equally popular at elementary with a slight tendency for the smaller systems to prefer the WISC and the larger systems the Stanford-Binet.

TABLE 3-5

ELEMENTARY — Individual Intelligence Tests

Grades in Which Administered	Percentages of school systems administering individual intelligence tests in various grades.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Pre-School	1	1	10	17	—	4
Kindergarten	1	2	12	17	—	5
1st Grade	6	9	16	17	—	10
2nd Grade	5	11	17	27	—	11
3rd Grade	5	9	23	31	—	12
4th Grade	6	9	20	35	—	12
5th Grade	6	9	20	31	—	11
6th Grade	7	9	20	31	—	12

TABLE 3-6

SECONDARY — Individual Intelligence Tests

Grades in Which Administered	Percentages of school systems administering individual intelligence tests in various grades.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
7th Grade	2	8	33	44	—	13
8th Grade	2	7	33	44	—	13
9th Grade	2	7	29	48	—	13
10th Grade	2	4	32	40	—	11
11th Grade	—	4	27	40	—	10
12th Grade	—	2	24	36	—	8

TABLE 3-7

ELEMENTARY — Individual Intelligence Tests

TEST	Percentages of school systems administering different individual intelligence tests.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Stanford-Binet Scale	2	3	13	38	—	7
Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC)	5	6	12	15	—	8
Other	2	3	8	4	—	4

The Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children is the most-used individual intelligence test at the secondary level although both the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale and the Stanford-Binet are used in almost as many schools.

Multi-Aptitude Batteries

Most multi-aptitude batteries are designed for use with older students and adults and very few elementary schools use them although five per cent of the elementary schools report using the SRA Primary Abilities Battery.

Table 3-9 shows the grades at which Multi-Aptitude Batteries are used in high schools and we find almost 60 per cent of the schools administer a multi-aptitude battery in ninth grade. One-third of the suburban schools use a battery at the eighth grade level and a smaller number of schools use one in tenth grade. The Differential Aptitude Tests (DAT) is by far the most popular multi-aptitude battery as shown in Table 3-10 where we see that three-fourths of Minnesota schools administer the DAT to their students sometime during their secondary career.

Achievement Batteries

The very intensive use of standardized achievement batteries in Minnesota elementary schools is shown in Table 3-11. An achievement battery is given in almost every Minnesota system in grades 4, 5, and 6 with 95 per cent of the Minnesota schools administering achievement batteries at the sixth grade level. As was the case with tests of scholastic aptitude, there is a slight tendency for the larger school system to use more achievement batteries than the smaller systems. Table 3-12 shows that the usage of achievement batteries in high school is not so high as in elementary. The ninth grade is clearly the most popular year for the use of achievement batteries with almost two-thirds of the schools giving one at that grade. The next most popular year is the eleventh grade where over one-half of the schools administer one.

The particular achievement batteries used in Minnesota schools are shown in Tables 3-13 and 3-14. The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) is clearly the most popular at the elementary level, being used in two-thirds of Minnesota schools, while the

TABLE 3-8

SECONDARY — Individual Intelligence Tests

TEST	Percentages of school systems administering different individual intelligence tests					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Stanford-Binet Scale	1	2	16	16	—	6
Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS)	—	2	14	24	—	5
Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC)	1	6	22	24	—	9
Other	—	—	1	4	—	*

* Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 3-9

SECONDARY — Multi-Aptitude Batteries

Grades in Which Administered	Percentages of school systems administering multi-aptitude batteries in various grades.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
7th Grade	1	2	—	—	—	1
8th Grade	9	8	15	36	33	11
9th Grade	47	63	70	56	67	59
10th Grade	13	3	8	8	—	7
11th Grade	2	1	—	—	—	1
12th Grade	2	2	2	—	—	2

TABLE 3-10

SECONDARY — Multi-Aptitude Batteries

TEST	Percentages of school systems administering different multi-aptitude batteries.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Differential Aptitude Tests	64	72	90	96	100	75
Jastak Test of Potential Ability and Behavior Stability	1	—	—	—	—	1
SRA Primary Mental Abilities	—	2	1	—	—	1
Academic Promise Tests	—	1	—	—	—	*

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 3-11

ELEMENTARY — Achievement Batteries

Grades in Which Administered	Percentages of school systems administering achievement batteries in various grades.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Pre School	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kindergarten	—	—	—	—	—	—
1st Grade	28	43	52	46	33	40
2nd Grade	33	51	60	42	67	47
3rd Grade	91	91	94	85	67	91
4th Grade	92	94	98	96	100	94
5th Grade	91	92	98	96	100	94
6th Grade	93	95	97	96	100	95

next two most-used batteries, the Metropolitan Achievement Tests and the Stanford Achievement Tests are used in one-fourth and one-fifth of the schools, respectively.

In high school, the ITBS at grades 7 and 8 and the Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITED) in grades 9-12 account for almost all of the achievement testing in Minnesota secondary schools. The larger systems are more apt to administer the ITBS in grades 7 and 8 than the smaller systems, but this difference does not hold with ITED since only 14 per cent of all Minnesota schools do not administer this particular battery.

Reading Readiness Tests

Reading readiness tests, tests designed to measure aptitude for learning to read, are largely limited to the elementary level. Only two per cent of all Minnesota high schools report the use of reading readiness tests anywhere in the six high school years. Table 3-15 presents the use of reading readiness tests at the various elementary grade level. Over one-third of the schools administer such a test during the kindergarten year and their use in kindergarten appears at first to be a function of school size. However, reference to Table A-IV-1, which shows percentages

TABLE 3-12

SECONDARY — Achievement Batteries

Grades in Which Administered	Percentages of school systems administering achievement batteries in various grades.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
7th Grade	31	32	48	48	67	36
8th Grade	33	32	42	40	100	35
9th Grade	63	58	69	80	67	63
10th Grade	42	40	41	44	33	41
11th Grade	49	51	52	56	67	51
12th Grade	27	14	13	8	—	17

of schools operating kindergartens, indicates it is more likely related to whether or not the school has a full-year kindergarten since the smaller systems are less likely to operate a kindergarten. One-third of the schools administer reading readiness tests in first grade and the frequency of use drops off rapidly in the higher grades from that point.

As shown in Table 3-16, the Metropolitan Reading Readiness Tests is clearly the most popular test with Minnesota elementary educators; almost one-half use this instrument. No other reading readiness test is used by more than five per cent of the schools.

TABLE 3-13

ELEMENTARY — Achievement Batteries

TEST	Percentages of school systems administering different achievement batteries.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
California Achievement Tests	—	2	1	4	—	1
Coordinated Scales of Attainment	6	5	—	—	—	4
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills	80	78	68	85	33	77
Metropolitan Achievement Tests	15	26	37	23	33	25
SRA Achievement Series	5	4	6	—	—	4
Sequential Tests of Educational Progress	—	—	—	4	—	*
Stanford Achievement Test	14	18	29	31	33	20
Other	1	—	—	4	—	*

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 3-14

SECONDARY — Achievement Batteries

TEST	Percentages of school systems administering different achievement batteries.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
California Achievement Tests	1	3	3	—	—	2
Coordinated Scales of Attainment	1	2	—	—	—	1
Essential High School Content Battery	1	—	—	—	—	*
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills	25	27	42	44	100	31
Iowa Tests of Educational Development	88	83	87	100	100	86
Metropolitan Achievement Tests	2	1	1	4	—	1
National Educational Development Tests	6	3	3	—	—	4
Pupil Record of Educational Progress	1	2	1	4	—	1
SRA Achievement Series	2	3	4	8	—	3
SRA High School Placement Test	—	3	—	—	—	1
Sequential Tests of Educational Progress	—	—	1	8	—	1
Stanford Achievement Test	2	2	7	4	—	3
Other	4	3	2	4	33	3

* Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 3-15

ELEMENTARY — Reading Readiness Tests

Grades in Which Administered	Percentages of school systems administering reading readiness tests in various grades.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Pre School	2	4	4	—	—	3
Kindergarten	20	40	60	42	—	38
1st Grade	35	35	31	42	67	35
2nd Grade	18	17	14	12	—	16
3rd Grade	1	1	1	—	—	1
4th Grade	—	1	—	—	—	*
5th Grade	—	1	—	—	—	*
6th Grade	—	1	—	4	—	1

* Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 3-16

ELEMENTARY — Reading Readiness Tests

TEST	Percentages of school systems administering different reading readiness tests.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Gates Reading Readiness Tests	5	5	7	8	—	5
Harrison-Stroud Reading Readiness Profiles	2	3	4	4	33	3
Lee-Clark Reading Readiness Test	2	4	2	—	33	3
Metropolitan Readiness Tests	30	49	68	77	67	49
Other	9	8	4	4	—	7

Reading Tests

Reading tests here include only standardized reading tests and not those which are part of a school's instructional reading program materials. It can be seen in Table 3-17 that about one-fifth of Minnesota schools are using standardized reading tests from the first grade on. The larger systems seem inclined to administer more reading tests at the second grade, and nearly half the suburban schools do so. It is not known, of course, whether the 20 per cent of schools administering a reading test at each grade level are the same schools testing each year or are different schools testing less often.

Reading tests are not uncommon at the secondary level, and Table 3-18 shows that more schools use reading tests in seventh grade than in any elementary grade except second. Use of a reading test at the seventh grade is very much a function of school size as only nine per cent of the small schools use such a test compared with over two-thirds of the suburban schools. The suburban school systems use substantially more reading tests than other schools, especially at the seventh and tenth grade levels.

The particular reading tests used in Minnesota schools are shown in Tables 3-19 and 3-20. The Gates Tests account for all but a small portion of the elementary reading tests. The Gates Reading Test, used in 17 per cent of the elementary schools, is the most popular at that level while the Gates Reading Survey, used in 13 per cent of the schools, is the most popular high school reading test. Almost two-thirds of the suburban high schools administer this test to their students. The Diagnostic Reading Tests, Nelson-Denny Reading Test, and Iowa Silent Reading Tests are all used in about five per cent of the systems.

Interest Inventories

Tables 3-21 and 3-22, report on the use of interest inventories at the secondary level.* Interest tests are not reported for elementary grades since virtually none are given.

---

*Different from other tables in this chapter, these tables count a school as among those using an interest test no matter how many or how few in a class are tested. Also see Table 4-1, showing that a substantial number of schools use interest tests with less than entire classes.

TABLE 3-17

ELEMENTARY — Reading Tests

Grades in Which Administered	Percentages of school systems administering reading tests in various grades.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Kindergarten	1	1	1	—	—	1
1st Grade	12	18	30	12	—	18
2nd Grade	19	20	32	42	33	24
3rd Grade	19	20	26	12	33	20
4th Grade	21	22	22	15	—	21
5th Grade	21	21	26	15	—	21
6th Grade	21	21	28	19	—	22

TABLE 3-18

SECONDARY — Reading Tests

Grades in Which Administered	Percentages of school systems administering reading tests in various grades.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
7th Grade	9	23	49	68	—	27
8th Grade	10	12	33	36	—	17
9th Grade	11	10	22	20	—	13
10th Grade	5	5	15	44	—	9
11th Grade	4	4	7	8	—	5
12th Grade	4	3	7	4	—	4

TABLE 3-19

ELEMENTARY — Reading Tests

TEST	Percentages of school systems administering different reading tests.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Basic Reading Test	2	—	1	—	—	1
Diagnostic Reading Tests (Triggs)	2	—	—	—	—	*
Doren Diagnostic Reading Test	—	2	—	—	—	1
Durrell-Sullivan Reading Capacity and Achievement Test	—	1	—	4	—	1
Gates Basic Reading Tests	13	13	30	23	—	17
Gates Reading Survey	9	11	17	12	—	11
Gilmore Oral Reading Test	1	2	—	—	—	1
Gray's Oral Reading Test	1	2	2	—	—	1
Iowa Silent Reading Tests	2	2	1	—	—	1
Lee-Clark Reading Test	—	2	—	—	—	1
Nelson-Denny Reading Test	3	1	—	4	—	1
Nelson Silent Reading Test	1	1	—	—	—	1
New Developmental Reading Tests (Bond, Balow, Hoyt)	1	2	3	12	33	3
SRA Reading Record	4	3	2	—	—	3
Stroud-Hieronymus Primary Reading Profiles	5	2	2	4	—	3
Other	5	3	7	4	33	4

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

The freshmen and senior years are the two grades at which most interest tests are given in Minnesota, with no large number of students taking such tests at other times. At the ninth grade there are interesting differences associated with size of school systems in that only 16 per cent of the smallest schools administer interest inventories to their freshmen while 84 per cent of the suburban schools do. On the other hand, the use of interest inventories in the senior year stands at about 70 per cent across all school sizes. Notice that although 70 per cent of the Minnesota high schools use interest inventories, none of the three urban school districts report their use.

The Kuder Preference Record and the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB) account for nearly all the interest testing in Minnesota. It would be safe to say that practically all the interest tests shown in Table 3-21 as given at ninth grade are the Kuder. Although not shown in the tables, eight per cent

TABLE 3-20

SECONDARY — Reading Tests

TEST	Percentages of school systems administering different reading tests.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Diagnostic Reading Tests (Triggs)	2	3	12	20	—	6
Gates Basic Reading Tests	1	2	4	—	—	2
Gates Reading Survey	2	10	23	60	—	13
Iowa Silent Reading Tests	2	3	13	—	—	4
Nelson-Denny Reading Test	2	4	7	16	—	5
New Developmental Reading Tests (Bond, Balow, Hoyt)	—	1	—	—	—	*
Reading Comprehension: Cooperative English Tests	1	1	—	—	—	*
SRA Reading Record	2	3	8	4	—	3
Other	2	3	12	4	—	5

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

of the schools use Kuder-Vocational at the twelfth grade and about 60 per cent administer SVIB. There is a slight tendency for the larger school systems to use fewer female SVIB's as compared with the smaller schools where the use of the men's and women's Blanks is about equal.

Personality Tests

Not many Minnesota high schools administer personality tests "across the board," although there are some schools using them at each secondary grade.* Twelve per cent of Minnesota schools administer a personality test to their freshmen.

The Minnesota Counseling Inventory (MCI) is the personality inventory most commonly used in Minnesota; three times as many schools use it as the Kuder Preference Record—Personal, the second most popular instrument.

---

*Unlike the tables reporting the use of interest inventories, Tables 3-23 and 3-24 include only schools which administer a personality test to all pupils at a particular grade level. For example, several schools report using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) although all these schools say the inventory is used only with a small number of specially selected students.

TABLE 3-21

SECONDARY — Interest Inventories

Grades in Which Administered	Percentages of school systems administering interest inventories in various grades.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
7th Grade	—	1	—	—	—	*
8th Grade	—	1	2	4	—	1
9th Grade	16	47	81	84	—	47
10th Grade	—	3	2	4	—	2
11th Grade	3	3	10	8	—	5
12th Grade	70	70	68	68	—	69

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

Study Skills Inventories

Only three high schools reported that they administered study skills inventories to their students. The tests used were the Brown-Holtzman Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes and the California Study Methods Survey.

A Word About Freshmen Testing

The preceding tables clearly show that freshmen are by far the most tested class in Minnesota high schools. Sixty per cent of the schools administer a multi-aptitude battery to their ninth graders and one-third administer a general scholastic aptitude test. (There is, of course, some overlap in that some schools may

TABLE 3-22

SECONDARY — Interest Inventories

TEST	Percentages of school systems administering different interest inventories.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Brainerd Occupational Preference Inventory	—	—	—	4	—	*
Gordon Occupational Check List	—	1	4	—	—	1
Kuder Preference Record—Occupational	5	16	23	16	—	14
Kuder Preference Record—Vocational	18	42	69	84	—	43
Minnesota Vocational Interest Inventory (Clark)	2	2	2	4	—	2
Strong Vocational Interest Blank—Men	63	62	58	68	—	61
Strong Vocational Interest Blank—Women	62	60	54	52	—	58
Your Educational Plans	2	1	—	—	—	1
Other	2	1	—	4	—	1

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

administer both types of tests to their freshmen). Two-thirds of the school give an achievement battery at ninth grade. Although more seniors than freshmen take interest inventories, almost half of Minnesota schools administer an interest inventory to their freshmen. Most of the personality inventories administered in Minnesota high schools are given to freshmen.

Although it is not clear what factors contribute most to this heavy testing at ninth grade these may be significant:

1. Eighty six per cent of Minnesota systems have "occupation units" included in their curricula, most of them at the ninth grade. Standardized test results are often integrated into these units and discussed as part of the "know thyself" emphasis. (See the discussion of Occupations Units in Appendix XI).

2. Some Minnesota school districts gain a large number of students from rural and/or parochial schools at the ninth grade and therefore plan more comprehensive testing at this time.

3. The freshmen year is a "decision" year in that many schools ask students to plan a three-year program for the senior high school years and encourage them to think beyond high school. There is often more emphasis on long-range planning at this point in the student's school career than at any other time with the exception, of course, of the senior year. As these decisions are faced it is natural that the school and the student want more information than they need at other times.

TABLE 3-23

SECONDARY — Personality Tests

Grades in Which Administered	Percentages of school systems administering personality tests in various grades.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
7th Grade	—	1	2	—	—	1
8th Grade	—	—	1	—	—	*
9th Grade	9	17	7	—	—	12
10th Grade	4	7	6	—	—	6
11th Grade	3	2	2	4	—	3
12th Grade	5	2	1	—	—	3

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 3-24

SECONDARY — Personality Tests

TEST	Percentages of school systems administering different personality tests.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Bell Adjustment Inventory	—	1	—	—	—	*
California Test of Personality	—	—	1	—	—	*
Kuder Preference Record—Personal	3	6	4	—	—	5
Minnesota Counseling Inventory	16	20	14	4	—	16
SRA Youth Inventory	—	1	2	—	—	1
Other	—	1	3	—	—	1

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

Chapter 4

Practices Relating to the Administration of Standardized Tests

The tables in this chapter report the responses to questionnaire items seeking information relating to the administration of standardized tests. There are six tables:

1. Proportion of pupils taking the test.
2. The number of times the test is administered each school year.
3. The time during the school year when the test is given.
4. The title of the persons administering the test.
5. The persons or agency scoring the test.
6. The method of recording the test results.

The nature of the questionnaire was such that schools answered each item for every standardized test given at every grade level. Thus there is an almost unlimited number of possible combinations for grouping the data. Responses could be tabulated by each test specifically by name, by each type of test, by each grade level, and for all combinations. In grouping the data for presentation here responses were tabulated for different types of tests only, and not for specific tests by name. In many cases the responses for several grades have been combined. The intent was to combine grade levels for particular tests where practices are likely to be the same across the grade levels included. In some cases, where few or no tests of a particular type are given at certain grade levels, no results are reported. Responses were tabulated for the following tests:*

---

*Readers interested in analyses more detailed or different from those presented here should feel free to contact the Project Director.

ELEMENTARY		SECONDARY	
Test	*Grades*	*Test*	*Grades*
Reading Readiness	K	Scholastic Aptitude	7-9
Reading Readiness	1	Scholastic Aptitude	10-12
Reading	K-3	Achievement Batteries	7-8
Reading	4-6	Achievement Batteries	9-12
Scholastic Aptitude	K-3	Reading	7-12
Scholastic Aptitude	4-6	Multi-Aptitude Batteries	7-12
Achievement Batteries	K-3	Interest	9
Achievement Batteries	4-6	Interest	12
		Personality	7-12

The tables present responses for every test of the particular type administered in one school year in any or all of the included grades. For example, if a school used an achievement battery only once in grades 4-6, there is only one response to each question from that school included in the "Achievement Batteries, 4-6" section of the table. On the other hand, if a school used an achievement battery in each grade, 4, 5, and 6, there are three responses to each question from that school included in the table (one for each grade).

Proportion of Pupils Taking the Test

Table 4-1 shows that schools using standardized tests generally administer them to all students of a particular grade. Exceptions are reading tests, interest tests, personality tests, and to some extent scholastic aptitude batteries at certain grade levels. About 25 per cent of the elementary schools administer reading tests to only small percentages of their student body at some grades. Schools reporting the use of scholastic aptitude tests at the senior high school level report that they are given to only small numbers of students in about one-fourth of the cases and this is particularly true in the larger school systems. It is likely that most of these cases involve students new to the particular school system and for whom standardized tests data are not available.

Interest tests at the high school level show considerable variation in the extent of coverage. Schools using interest tests at the ninth grade level tend to administer them to the entire student body while this is less often the case with seniors. Interest inventories are administered to the entire senior class in most of the smaller schools, in about half of the larger schools, and in about a third of the suburban systems.

TABLE 4-1

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Proportion of Pupils Taking Tests

Percentages of School Systems reporting various proportions of pupils taking particular types of tests in selected grades.

Approximately what proportion of the pupils in the grade take the test?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Reading Readiness, K						Reading Readiness, 1						Reading, K-3						Reading, 4-6					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
More than 96%	92	97	95	91	—	95	93	97	97	100	100	96	87	76	94	90	100	85	74	64	84	59	—	71
75–94%	4	1	4	—	—	2	—	—	3	—	—	1	2	1	—	—	—	1	8	2	—	—	—	3
50–74%	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	—	—	—	1	—	3	1	—	—	1	—	2	—	—	—	1
25–49%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	3	—	—	—	3	9	4	4	—	—	5
Less than 24%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	3	1	10	—	3	4	10	12	18	—	9
Only a small number of selected pupils	—	1	—	9	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	6	—	—	—	3	5	13	—	18	—	8
No Response	4	—	2	—	—	1	4	1	—	—	—	2	3	8	3	—	—	5	1	4	—	6	—	2
	Scholastic Aptitude, K-3						Scholastic Aptitude, 4-6						Scholastic Aptitude, 7-9						Scholastic Aptitude, 10-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
More than 96%	95	93	91	85	100	93	91	91	88	76	100	89	96	91	82	72	100	89	91	73	60	60	100	72
75–94%	1	2	1	—	—	2	2	3	—	—	—	2	1	—	—	—	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	1
50–74%	1	—	—	—	—	*	1	—	—	—	—	*	—	—	1	—	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—
25–49%	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	*	—	—	3	—	—	1
Less than 24%	1	1	5	—	—	2	1	—	7	5	—	2	1	2	7	8	—	3	—	6	8	8	—	5
Only a small number of selected pupils	—	2	1	15	—	2	—	4	3	17	—	4	—	5	8	21	—	5	4	15	29	32	—	18
No Response	2	1	2	—	—	2	2	1	1	2	—	2	1	3	1	—	—	2	4	5	—	—	—	3
	Achievement Batteries, K-3						Achievement Batteries, 4-6						Achievement Batteries, 7-8						Achievement Batteries, 9-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
More than 96%	95	97	95	100	100	96	96	95	96	98	100	96	94	98	100	83	100	96	91	96	93	98	80	94
75–94%	1	1	—	—	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	1	2	1	1	—	—	1
50–74%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	*
25–49%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	*	—	2	—	—	—	1	1	2	—	—	20	1
Less than 24%	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	2	—	*	—	—	—	8	—	1	1	—	1	2	—	1
Only a small number of selected pupils	—	1	2	—	—	1	—	1	1	—	—	*	—	—	—	4	—	1	1	—	2	—	—	1
No Response	3	2	4	—	—	2	2	3	1	—	—	2	3	—	—	4	—	1	3	2	3	—	—	2

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 4-1—Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Proportion of Pupils Taking Tests

Percentage of school systems reporting various proportion of pupils taking particular types of tests in selected grades.

Approximately what proportion of the pupils in the grade take the test?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES											
	Reading Test, 7-12						Multi-Aptitude Batteries, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
More than 95%	68	68	60	60	—	64	93	94	95	100	100	94
75–94%	—	—	—	4	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
50–74%	—	1	4	4	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—
25–49%	14	1	3	1	—	5	1	1	1	—	—	1
Less than 24%	18	1	10	4	—	8	—	—	—	—	—	—
Only a small number of selected pupils	—	28	21	17	—	19	2	—	2	—	—	1
No Response	—	2	1	—	—	1	4	5	1	—	—	3

	Interest Tests, 9						Interest Tests, 12						Personality Tests, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
More than 95%	95	92	93	91	—	93	94	76	47	34	—	73	88	81	37	8	—	59
75–94%	—	—	—	5	—	1	—	1	3	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
50–74%	—	1	2	—	—	1	1	8	8	23	—	7	—	—	—	—	—	—
25–49%	—	1	4	—	—	2	2	8	25	17	—	10	—	—	—	2	—	1
Less than 24%	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	9	20	—	4	3	1	5	—	—	3
Only a small number of selected pupils	—	—	—	5	—	1	1	3	6	6	—	3	—	28	53	92	—	35
No Response	5	5	1	—	—	3	1	2	2	—	—	2	9	1	3	—	—	3

Larger and suburban school systems using personality inventories tend to give them only to small numbers of selected students. This is particularly true in the suburban systems where 92 per cent of the personality tests administered are given only to a few selected students. Most of these tests are probably assigned by a school psychologist.

Number of Times Tests are Administered Each School Year

Most standardized tests used in Minnesota schools are administered once each school year according to the data presented in Table 4-2. Exceptions include reading readiness tests administered in first grade and reading tests in elementary which are administered more than once in about one-fourth of the cases. Scholastic aptitude tests at the senior high school level are given irregularly in 14 per cent of the systems.

A number of schools still administer achievement batteries twice each year. This is particularly true in the smaller systems where about 15 per cent of the schools administer an achievement battery more than once each year.

Personality tests are administered irregularly in 37 per cent of the schools, reflecting the data in the previous table which showed that only small numbers of pupils take these tests in most schools.

Time of School Year for Administration of Standardized Tests

Table 4-3 shows the time of year in which tests are administered. Reading readiness tests given at the kindergarten level tend to be administered in the spring of the year. This timing shifts at first grade, and over half of the reading readiness tests given at the first grade level are administered in the fall. There is considerable variation in the time of year in which reading tests are given at both the elementary and secondary levels.

Generally speaking, scholastic aptitude tests tend to be administered in the fall although a substantial number of these tests are administered in the winter and spring at the elementary level. Testing for scholastic aptitude for students transferring later in high school is, of course, irregular.

TABLE 4-2

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Number of Times Tests are Given

Percentage of school systems giving particular types of tests in selected grades various numbers of times each school year.

How often is the test given?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Reading Readiness, K						Reading Readiness, 1						Reading, K-3						Reading, 4-6					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Once each year	88	94	96	100	—	94	74	71	87	85	100	76	69	67	81	100	—	73	54	62	71	94	—	68
Twice each year	4	5	2	—	—	3	9	15	—	—	—	9	14	10	13	—	—	11	19	13	19	—	—	15
More than two times a year	—	—	2	—	—	1	7	7	10	—	—	7	4	1	6	—	—	3	9	—	4	—	—	3
Once every other year	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	*	7	—	—	—	—	2
Some other regular schedule	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	1	—	8	—	2	7	6	—	—	100	5	4	6	—	—	—	4
Irregularly	—	1	—	—	—	1	2	3	—	8	—	2	3	12	—	—	—	6	3	13	4	—	—	8
No Response	8	—	—	—	—	1	4	3	3	—	—	3	3	4	—	—	—	2	5	6	3	6	—	5
	Scholastic Aptitude, K-3						Scholastic Aptitude, 4-6						Scholastic Aptitude, 7-9						Scholastic Aptitude, 10-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Once each year	84	90	98	97	100	90	75	81	91	88	80	82	89	92	96	74	100	91	70	86	79	64	100	78
Twice each year	—	2	—	—	—	1	1	5	—	—	—	2	—	—	1	—	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—
More than two times a year	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—
Once every other year	9	3	—	—	—	4	13	4	—	5	20	6	10	1	—	—	—	4	25	—	—	—	—	6
Some other regular schedule	2	2	1	3	—	2	3	4	3	5	—	4	—	2	—	—	—	1	—	4	2	—	—	2
Irregularly	2	2	1	—	—	2	3	2	4	—	—	2	1	5	3	23	—	4	6	8	19	36	—	14
No Response	4	1	—	—	—	2	6	3	3	2	—	4	1	1	1	—	—	1	—	3	—	—	—	1
	Achievement Batteries, K-3						Achievement Batteries, 4-6						Achievement Batteries, 7-8						Achievement Batteries, 9-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Once each year	81	83	94	100	100	86	78	80	91	96	100	[illegible]	88	94	95	88	100	92	95	98	98	94	100	97
Twice each year	10	15	4	—	—	10	14	17	7	4	—	[illegible]	5	4	2	4	—	4	1	1	2	2	—	1
More than two times a year	1	—	1	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	*
Once every other year	1	—	—	—	—	*	2	—	—	—	—	*	2	2	—	—	—	1	2	1	—	4	—	1
Some other regular schedule	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	*
Irregularly	4	1	2	—	—	2	[illegible]	1	1	—	—	2	2	—	2	4	—	2	1	—	—	—	—	*
No Response	2	1	*	—	—	1	3	2	—	—	—	2	2	—	—	4	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	*

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 4-2 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Number of Times Tests are Given

Percentage of school systems giving particular types of tests in selected grades various numbers of times each school year.

How often is the test given?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES											
	Reading Test, 7-12						Multi-Aptitude Batteries, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Once each year	58	52	50	73	—	55	94	98	100	100	100	97
Twice each year	42	20	21	19	—	24	—	—	—	—	—	—
More than two times a year	—	9	4	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	—
Once every other year	—	1	—	—	—	*	2	—	—	—	—	1
Some other regular schedule	—	—	1	—	—	*	—	1	—	—	—	*
Irregularly	—	19	23	8	—	16	3	1	—	—	—	1
No Response	—	—	1	—	—	*	1	1	—	—	—	1

	Interest Tests, 9						Interest Tests, 12						Personality Tests, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Once each year	95	97	94	95	—	95	97	97	95	94	—	96	91	66	41	8	—	59
Twice each year	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
More than two times a year	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Once every other year	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	2
Some other regular schedule	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	2	—	—	1	3	—	—	—	—	1
Irregularly	—	1	4	5	—	2	2	3	3	6	—	3	—	31	58	92	—	37
No Response	5	1	1	—	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	1	6	1	2	—	—	2

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 4-3

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Time of School Year for Administration of Tests

Percentages of school systems giving particular types of tests in selected grades at various times during the year.

When is the test given?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Reading Readiness, K						Reading Readiness, 1						Reading, K-3						Reading, 4-6					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
In the fall	15	9	4	—	—	8	52	49	57	77	100	55	17	12	26	67	100	20	16	16	37	53	—	22
In the winter	—	1	2	9	—	2	7	3	—	—	—	3	6	12	11	—	—	9	14	8	—	—	—	8
In the spring	77	82	93	91	—	85	15	17	23	—	—	16	31	42	48	33	—	39	17	39	32	47	—	32
Both fall and spring	4	4	—	—	—	2	7	10	—	—	—	6	7	5	7	—	—	5	13	9	11	—	—	10
Both winter and spring	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	—	—	—	2	4	7	—	—	—	4	3	4	—	—	—	3
Both fall and winter	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	3	3	—	—	3	—	—	1	—	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fall, winter, and spring	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	—	—	—	1	3	1	—	—	—	1	6	—	4	—	—	3
No specified time	—	3	2	—	—	2	9	11	17	23	—	12	25	18	8	—	—	16	24	20	13	—	—	19
No Response	4	1	—	—	—	1	4	1	—	—	—	2	8	4	—	—	—	5	7	3	3	—	—	4
	Scholastic Aptitude, K-3						Scholastic Aptitude, 4-6						Scholastic Aptitude, 7-9						Scholastic Aptitude, 10-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
In the fall	52	48	60	72	100	53	50	54	67	79	20	57	75	81	84	67	100	79	55	60	52	68	100	58
In the winter	25	33	30	15	—	29	24	29	18	7	—	23	13	9	2	—	—	8	25	24	14	8	—	20
In the spring	17	14	9	—	—	13	14	8	9	7	80	11	6	5	7	5	—	6	9	8	10	8	—	9
Both fall and spring	1	1	—	—	—	1	—	3	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	1
Both winter and spring	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Both fall and winter	1	—	—	—	—	*	1	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fall, winter, and spring	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
No specified time	2	2	1	13	—	2	4	3	5	7	—	4	4	4	5	23	—	5	8	5	24	16	—	12
No Response	3	2	—	—	—	2	7	3	1	—	—	3	2	1	1	3	—	1	—	3	—	—	—	1
	Achievement Batteries, K-3						Achievement Batteries, 4-6						Achievement Batteries, 7-8						Achievement Batteries, 9-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
In the fall	20	16	28	36	—	21	31	28	47	62	57	36	49	45	58	72	60	52	81	82	85	88	60	82
In the winter	19	10	10	13	50	13	19	16	12	19	—	16	14	14	1	—	—	9	12	11	2	4	20	9
In the spring	46	57	56	49	50	53	31	36	33	14	44	32	30	36	37	13	40	33	6	6	10	4	20	7
Both fall and spring	12	13	3	—	—	10	15	15	7	4	—	13	5	5	2	4	—	4	—	1	2	2	—	1
Both winter and spring	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Both fall and winter	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fall, winter, and spring	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No specified time	1	1	2	—	—	1	—	1	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	*
No Response	1	2	1	2	—	1	3	3	1	1	—	2	2	—	13	—	—	2	1	*	1	2	—	1

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 4-3 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Time of School Year for Administration of Tests

Percentages of school systems giving particular types of tests in selected grades at various times during the year.

When is the test given?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES											
	Reading Test, 7-12						Multi-Aptitude Batteries, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
In the fall	32	29	24	38	—	29	84	90	88	80	100	87
In the winter	9	5	4	6	—	5	6	8	8	—	—	7
In the spring	23	12	19	17	—	17	3	1	3	16	—	3
Both fall and spring	37	22	12	10	—	19	—	—	—	—	—	—
Both winter and spring	—	—	4	4	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—
Both fall and winter	—	3	3	4	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fall, winter, and spring	—	—	4	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—
No specified time	—	29	29	15	—	22	5	—	—	—	—	1
No Response	—	—	—	6	—	1	1	1	—	4	—	1

	Interest Tests, 9						Interest Tests, 12						Personality Tests, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
In the fall	36	28	28	32	—	29	78	83	83	80	—	81	76	50	22	8	—	43
In the winter	50	46	46	41	—	46	17	10	11	9	—	12	12	15	19	17	—	16
In the spring	9	19	15	9	—	16	2	2	3	—	—	2	6	3	8	17	—	6
Both fall and spring	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Both winter and spring	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Both fall and winter	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	1	2	—	—	1
Fall, winter, and spring	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No specified time	—	5	5	18	—	6	3	4	3	11	—	4	—	31	49	58	—	33
No Response	5	1	4	—	—	2	1	1	—	—	—	1	6	—	—	—	—	1

Starting with a tendency for spring administration of achievement batteries in the early elementary grades, there is a shift toward fall testing as the upper grade levels are approached, and 82 per cent of the achievement batteries in grades 9-12 are given in the fall. A third of the achievement batteries at the junior high school level are administered in the spring, however.

The time of the year for the administration of reading tests at the secondary level is quite varied.

Most ninth grade interest tests are administered in the winter, probably reflecting the time of the year for the "occupation unit" in many school systems.

Who Administers Standardized Tests

The titles of the persons with responsibility for administering tests are shown in Table 4-4. Most standardized tests are administered by classroom teachers at the elementary level with principals giving some help, particularly with scholastic aptitude tests in the larger school systems.

Principals in the smaller Minnesota high schools are most apt to administer tests to students with the guidance counselor taking over this function in the larger systems. For example, two-thirds of the scholastic aptitude tests in the smaller-size school districts are administered by the principal whereas about 85 per cent are administered by the counselors in the larger school systems. Almost all elementary-level achievement batteries are given by the classroom teacher and an even larger number of high school teachers administer achievement batteries, although the principals and guidance counselors are responsible for a good deal of this work at the secondary level.

Interest tests at the ninth grade level tend to be administered by the classroom teacher, probably the teacher of the "occupation unit." In contrast, the interest tests given at the twelfth grade are usually given by the principal in the smaller schools and the guidance counselor in the larger systems.

Personality tests, where used, are generally administered by the guidance counselor although the principals in the smaller schools are responsible for the administration of this type of test also. The larger systems often use a school psychologist to administer personality tests.

TABLE 4-4

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Who Administers Standardized Tests

Percentages of school systems reporting particular types of tests in selected grades being administered by various staff members.

Who administers the test?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Reading Readiness, K						Reading Readiness, 1						Reading, K-3						Reading, 4-6					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Classroom teacher	96	97	96	100	—	97	91	99	93	100	100	96	86	80	86	90	100	84	68	62	75	76	—	67
Guidance Counselor	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	*	—	1	1	6	—	1
School psychologist	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	*	—	—	4	—	—	1
Consulting psychologist	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Principal or assistant principal	4	3	4	—	—	3	2	—	3	—	—	1	4	14	9	—	—	9	15	18	8	—	—	15
Superintendent	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	3	—	—	1	7	4	4	10	—	5	13	16	12	18	—	15
No Response	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	1	—	—	—	2	3	2	—	—	—	2	3	3	—	—	—	2

	Scholastic Aptitude, K-3						Scholastic Aptitude, 4-6						Scholastic Aptitude, 7-9						Scholastic Aptitude, 10-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Classroom teacher	90	74	75	64	100	78	87	71	65	55	100	73	25	14	11	13	50	17	21	10	11	12	—	13
Guidance Counselor	1	3	2	—	—	2	3	4	4	5	—	3	12	48	82	85	50	46	8	51	87	84	100	55
School psychologist	1	—	1	3	—	1	—	—	3	5	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Consulting psychologist	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Principal or assistant principal	5	21	20	26	—	17	7	23	28	33	—	20	60	36	6	—	—	35	62	35	2	—	—	28
Superintendent	1	—	—	—	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	—	—	—	1	8	1	—	—	—	2
Other	1	—	1	5	—	1	1	—	1	2	—	1	—	2	—	3	—	1	—	—	—	4	—	1
No Response	2	2	—	3	—	1	3	2	—	—	—	2	1	—	1	—	—	1	2	3	—	—	—	1

	Achievement Batteries, K-3						Achievement Batteries, 4-6						Achievement Batteries, 7-8						Achievement Batteries, 9-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Classroom teacher	95	92	95	93	100	93	91	89	93	87	100	91	47	42	39	50	60	43	21	13	21	20	60	18
Guidance Counselor	—	—	1	—	—	—	2	1	—	—	—	1	10	34	58	42	40	34	17	51	75	76	40	47
School psychologist	1	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	1	4	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Consulting psychologist	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	*	1	—	—	—	—	*
Principal or assistant principal	2	6	3	4	—	4	4	8	4	6	—	5	38	22	4	—	—	20	58	34	2	—	—	32
Superintendent	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	—	—	—	1
Other	1	1	2	2	—	1	2	1	2	4	—	1	—	—	—	4	—	1	—	1	1	2	—	1
No Response	—	1	—	—	—	1	2	2	—	—	—	1	5	2	—	4	—	2	1	1	1	2	—	1

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 4-4 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Who Administers Standardized Tests

Percentages of school systems reporting particular types of tests
in selected grades being administered by various staff members.

Who administers the test?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES											
	Reading Tests, 7-12						Multi-Aptitude Batteries, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Classroom teacher	53	34	47	63	—	47	17	13	23	36	33	18
Guidance Counselor	7	28	22	29	—	22	17	62	74	56	67	52
School psychologist	—	9	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—
Consulting psychologist	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Principal or assistant principal	25	8	—	—	—	6	59	23	1	—	—	25
Superintendent	5	—	—	—	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	1
Other	11	22	31	8	—	22	4	1	1	8	—	3
No Response	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	1

	Interest Tests, 9						Interest Tests, 12						Personality Tests, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Classroom teacher	41	56	70	95	—	64	22	23	14	17	—	20	15	15	17	—	—	15
Guidance Counselor	27	38	22	5	—	27	14	46	84	83	—	46	3	69	78	58	—	60
School psychologist	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	5	42	—	6
Consulting psychologist	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Principal or assistant principal	27	5	2	—	—	6	59	29	3	—	—	31	76	9	—	—	—	17
Superintendent	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	1	—	—	—	1	3	1	—	—	—	1
Other	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	1
No Response	5	1	5	—	—	3	—	1	—	—	—	*	3	—	—	—	—	1

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

How Tests are Scored

Despite the advent of high-speed electronic scoring machines and computers, Table 4-5 shows that Minnesota teachers are still hand-scoring many standardized tests. This is particularly true at elementary where we find over 90 per cent of the reading readiness tests and three-fourths of the achievement batteries at the lower elementary grades are scored by the classroom teacher. Her more fortunate colleagues at the senior high level score only two per cent of the achievement batteries in the upper levels of high school.

Whether reading tests are scored by machine or teachers, seems to be more a function of the grade level than of the size of the system. On the other hand, there is a marked tendency for the larger systems to arrange for machine scoring of scholastic aptitude and achievement batteries. Two-thirds of the achievement batteries in the upper elementary grades in the suburban schools are scored by machines as compared with only one-fifth in the small-size school systems.

Notice that school principals hand-score more tests than do school clerical personnel!

Three-fourths of the interest tests administered at the ninth grade level are scored by the students which undoubtedly reflects the widespread use of the Kuder Preference Record. The Strong Vocational Interest Blank, in wide use at the twelfth grade level, is virtually impossible to score by hand and this is reflected in the table.

Recording of Test Results

The extensive use of elementary school teachers as clerks is again illustrated in Table 4-6 showing that about three-fourths of tests given at the elementary level are recorded by the classroom teacher. This is in extreme contrast to the situation at the secondary level where usually less than five per cent of the tests have the results recorded by classroom teachers. Counselors come in for their share of test recording work, particularly in the larger out-state systems. The suburban systems have apparently hired clerks to do most of this kind of work.

TABLE 4-5

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Who Scores Standardized Tests

Percentages of school systems reporting particular types of tests in selected grades being scored by various persons or agencies.

Who scores the test?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Reading Readiness, K						Reading Readiness, 1						Reading, K-3						Reading, 4-6					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Students	—	—	5	18	—	3	2	—	7	—	—	2	3	1	11	10	—	4	3	—	12	—	—	3
Clerk	4	1	2	9	—	2	2	1	3	—	—	2	—	3	11	—	—	4	—	4	8	6	—	4
Classroom teacher	88	95	91	73	—	91	87	96	83	100	100	92	84	77	62	81	100	76	58	58	59	53	—	58
Counselor or other personnel worker	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	1	1	—	—	1	5	2	3	6	—	3
Principal or other administrator	4	1	—	—	—	1	2	1	—	—	—	1	2	12	6	—	—	7	8	14	8	—	—	10
School-owned scoring machine	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Publisher's scoring service	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	3	—	—	—	1	12	3	—	18	—	6
Other scoring company	4	—	—	—	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other	—	—	2	—	—	1	2	—	7	—	—	2	6	2	8	10	—	5	11	14	11	18	—	13
No Response	—	1	—	—	—	1	4	1	—	—	—	2	2	2	—	—	—	1	3	4	—	—	—	3
	Scholastic Aptitude, K-3						Scholastic Aptitude, 4-6						Scholastic Aptitude, 7-9						Scholastic Aptitude, 10-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Students	1	—	4	3	—	1	1	—	3	2	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—	1
Clerk	3	4	10	10	—	6	2	5	11	10	—	6	3	4	10	3	—	5	—	15	22	24	—	15
Classroom teacher	82	69	54	46	—	68	74	65	47	38	—	61	9	2	1	8	—	4	19	1	—	—	—	5
Counselor or other personnel worker	1	3	3	—	—	2	4	2	5	5	—	3	3	17	23	28	—	15	6	40	38	32	—	30
Principal or other administrator	7	18	19	21	—	15	5	18	21	19	—	15	12	14	3	—	—	10	43	22	—	—	—	18
School-owned scoring machine	—	—	1	—	—	*	—	—	2	—	20	1	—	—	2	—	100	1	—	—	2	—	100	1
Publisher's scoring service	5	3	7	13	100	5	8	7	10	19	60	9	28	18	23	18	—	22	19	17	25	20	—	20
Other scoring company	1	—	—	5	—	1	2	—	1	7	—	1	39	41	35	41	—	39	11	3	8	24	—	7
Other	1	—	2	—	—	1	1	—	1	—	20	1	2	4	2	3	—	3	—	—	2	—	—	1
No Response	*	2	—	3	—	1	3	2	—	—	—	2	3	—	1	—	—	1	2	3	—	—	—	1

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 4-5 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Who Scores Standardized Tests

Percentages of school systems reporting particular types of tests in selected grades being scored by various persons or agencies.

Who scores the tes ?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Achievement Batteries, K-3						Achievement Batteries, 4-6						Achievement Batteries, 7-8						Achievement Batteries, 9-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Students	3	—	4	7	—	2	3	1	3	4	—	2	—	—	1	—	—	*	1	—	1	—	—	*
Clerk	—	3	2	—	—	1	—	2	2	2	—	1	2	6	6	8	—	5	1	1	2	2	—	[illegible]
Classroom teacher	80	75	66	58	83	73	70	56	48	20	11	57	30	15	6	8	—	16	3	2	2	2	—	2
Counselor or other personnel worker	—	1	2	—	—	1	1	1	1	—	—	1	5	16	4	4	—	9	1	2	—	—	—	1
Principal or other administrator	—	3	3	—	—	2	2	3	3	1	—	2	19	10	—	—	—	9	3	1	—	—	—	1
School-owned scoring machine	—	—	1	—	—	*	—	—	1	—	—	*	—	—	1	—	—	*	—	—	—	—	40	*
Publisher's scoring service	13	17	20	31	17	17	19	32	37	64	33	31	28	41	69	58	40	46	37	29	50	65	40	39
Other scoring company	1	—	1	4	—	1	3	2	5	8	22	3	12	10	11	8	60	11	53	61	42	27	20	52
Other	—	1	2	—	—	1	1	1	1	—	33	1	—	2	2	—	—	1	1	4	3	2	—	2
No Response	2	1	—	—	—	1	2	1	—	—	—	1	5	1	—	13	—	2	1	1	1	2	—	1

	Reading Tests, 7-12						Multi-Aptitude Batteries, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Students	—	1	3	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Clerk	5	7	9	29	—	10	1	1	3	4	—	2
Classroom teacher	35	27	39	21	—	32	1	1	1	8	—	2
Counselor or other personnel worker	7	40	17	13	—	22	4	3	1	—	—	3
Principal or other administrator	7	4	—	—	—	2	2	—	—	—	—	1
School-owned scoring machine	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	67	1
Publisher's scoring service	35	1	6	4	—	9	31	15	17	12	—	20
Other scoring company	4	—	3	23	—	5	57	72	72	72	33	68
Other	5	19	23	4	—	16	1	5	5	—	—	3
No Response	2	2	—	6	—	2	2	1	—	4	—	1

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 4-5 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Who Scores Standardized Tests

Percentages of school systems reporting particular types of tests in selected grades being scored by various persons or agencies.

Who scores the test?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																	
	Interest Tests, 9						Interest Tests, 12						Personality Tests, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Students	50	71	80	73	—	72	1	6	10	6	—	5	9	12	7	—	—	9
Clerk	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	6	—	1	—	1	8	—	—	3
Classroom teacher	23	11	5	23	—	11	1	—	1	—	—	1	3	2	7	—	—	4
Counselor or other personnel worker	5	10	5	—	—	6	1	4	3	6	—	3	—	37	58	92	—	40
Principal or other administrator	5	1	—	—	—	1	3	1	—	—	—	2	3	—	—	—	—	1
School-owned scoring machine	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Publisher's scoring machine	14	1	2	—	—	3	30	15	10	9	—	18	39	10	2	—	—	12
Other scoring company	—	4	1	—	—	2	60	66	75	74	—	66	39	32	19	8	—	28
Other	—	1	1	5	—	1	1	4	2	—	—	2	—	3	—	—	—	2
No Response	4	1	4	—	—	2	2	4	—	—	—	2	6	2	—	—	—	2

TABLE 4-6

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Who Records Standardized Tests

Percentages of school systems reporting particular types of tests in selected grades being recorded by various persons.

Who records the test scores?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Reading Readiness, K						Reading Readiness, 1						Reading, K-3						Reading, 4-6					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Students	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	—	1
Clerk	8	15	36	27	—	22	2	4	17	38	25	9	5	14	30	29	100	16	5	19	35	6	—	17
Teacher	77	77	60	73	—	72	87	82	73	62	75	80	84	70	64	71	—	72	65	57	59	88	—	61
Principal or other administrator	12	8	2	—	—	6	2	10	3	—	—	5	2	10	—	—	—	5	15	11	—	—	—	9
Counselor or other personnel worker	4	—	—	—	—	1	2	—	3	—	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	1	2	—	1	6	—	1
Other	—	—	2	—	—	1	2	—	3	—	—	1	6	2	3	—	—	3	10	10	—	—	—	8
No Response	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	4	—	—	—	3	2	4	2	—	—	3	3	3	1	—	—	2

	Scholastic Aptitude, K-3						Scholastic Aptitude, 4-6						Scholastic Aptitude, 7-9						Scholastic Aptitude, 10-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Students	5	—	—	—	—	1	4	—	—	—	—	1	2	1	1	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	1
Clerk	6	14	40	38	—	19	7	16	41	31	20	20	13	31	58	92	50	35	25	33	75	88	—	49
Teacher	76	66	45	46	—	63	76	66	41	48	20	61	7	2	1	—	—	3	6	—	—	—	—	1
Principal or other administrator	9	17	12	15	—	14	9	15	12	17	—	13	70	31	4	—	—	35	60	33	2	4	—	27
Counselor or other personnel worker	1	1	—	—	—	1	2	2	1	5	—	2	9	32	34	8	50	28	8	31	22	8	100	20
Other	2	—	2	—	100	1	1	—	4	—	60	2	—	2	2	—	—	1	—	—	2	—	—	1
No Response	1	2	—	—	—	1	2	2	2	—	—	2	1	1	1	—	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	1

	Achievement Batteries, K-3						Achievement Batteries, 4-6						Achievement Batteries, 7-8						Achievement Batteries, 9-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Students	1	—	—	—	—	*	1	—	—	—	—	*	—	4	—	—	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	1
Clerk	5	12	34	29	33	17	6	12	33	39	22	17	26	33	67	96	60	45	19	30	64	90	60	37
Teacher	86	79	58	71	50	75	84	77	60	61	44	74	12	9	5	—	—	8	2	2	2	—	—	2
Principal or other administrator	4	8	6	—	—	6	4	9	4	—	—	6	56	19	1	—	—	22	66	33	1	—	—	34
Counselor or other personnel worker	—	—	2	—	—	1	1	—	1	—	—	1	5	33	23	—	40	20	11	35	29	6	40	24
Other	1	1	1	—	17	1	2	1	1	—	33	1	—	—	2	—	—	1	—	—	3	4	—	1
No Response	1	1	—	—	—	1	2	1	—	—	—	1	2	2	1	4	—	2	1	*	1	—	—	1

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 4-6 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Who Records Standardized Tests

Percentages of school systems reporting particular types of tests in selected grades being recorded by various persons.

Who records the test scores?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES											
	Reading Tests, 7-12						Multi-Aptitude Batteries, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Students	—	—	—	2	—	*	2	1	—	—	—	1
Clerk	—	15	43	81	—	33	17	35	66	100	67	43
Teacher	53	19	20	10	—	28	1	1	1	—	—	1
Principal or other administrator	39	13	—	—	—	10	67	18	1	—	—	25
Counselor or other personnel worker	7	39	27	2	—	24	13	42	26	—	33	27
Other	—	12	10	4	—	8	—	—	6	—	—	1
No Response	2	3	—	—	—	1	1	2	—	—	—	1

	Interest Tests, 9						Interest Tests, 12						Personality Tests, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Students	5	16	14	14	—	14	—	—	4	—	—	1	3	1	—	—	—	1
Clerk	23	22	44	55	—	33	18	27	46	66	—	30	9	11	37	42	—	20
Teacher	—	10	4	—	—	5	2	—	—	—	—	1	—	6	—	—	—	2
Principal or other administrator	50	8	1	—	—	9	67	30	2	—	—	34	82	16	—	—	—	22
Counselor or other personnel worker	14	38	25	5	—	27	9	34	29	6	—	24	—	62	56	50	—	48
Other	5	4	6	23	—	7	2	4	16	29	—	7	3	2	5	8	—	4
No Response	4	3	6	4	—	5	2	4	3	—	—	3	3	1	2	—	—	2

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

Chapter 5

Reporting, Interpretation, and Use of Test Results

This chapter presents the school's reports of how results are used, to whom test results are reported, who interprets the test results, and the amount of confidence placed in the test results. The tables summarizing these data are similar in format to the tables in the preceding chapter, and the same introductory observations and comments apply. The groupings by types of tests and grade levels are identical and the precentages reported again show the per cent of response as a function of the times the particular type of test was administered in the grade level in question.

Kinds of Test Scores and Norms Available

Table 5-1 shows the availability of different kinds of test scores. There is, of course, great variation in the forms of scores available depending upon the type of test.*

Percentile ranks are the most common form of reading readiness scores for kindergarten and first grade although grade equivalents are almost as common and several other forms of scores are also used.

Two-thirds of the reading tests administered in the elementary grades result in grade equivalent scores while 57 per cent of the reading tests used at the secondary level yield these scores. Percentile ranks are more commonly available for reading tests at the secondary level than at elementary.

Despite efforts to do away with the IQ score, it is still very much with us, particularly in elementary schools. Noticeably more scholastic aptitude test results are recorded in terms of percentile rank scores at the junior high level than the elementary

---

*The percentages in the columns may total more than 100 since many schools have more than one type of score for a particular test.

TABLE 5-1

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Types of Test Scores

Percentages of school systems having various kinds of scores from various types of tests recorded in school records at selected grades.

In what form are the scores of this test recorded?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Reading Readiness, K						Reading Readiness, 1						Reading, K-3						Reading, 4-6					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Raw scores	35	38	22	27	—	31	41	38	40	23	25	38	39	25	14	14	100	27	24	28	27	—	—	25
I.Q. scores	4	6	2	—	—	4	9	3	3	—	—	4	5	5	—	—	—	3	6	5	—	—	—	4
Stanines	4	4	—	—	—	2	4	4	3	—	75	5	1	—	—	—	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—
Standard scores	—	8	16	—	—	9	4	19	10	8	—	12	10	12	12	10	—	11	6	15	13	18	—	12
Grade equivalents	23	21	16	9	—	19	35	36	40	15	—	34	49	71	76	71	—	65	59	70	73	59	—	57
Age equivalents	15	11	7	9	—	10	17	8	20	15	75	15	26	20	19	10	—	21	18	25	36	—	—	24
Percentile ranks	27	59	69	82	—	59	35	42	30	38	100	39	28	37	30	33	100	33	33	37	24	35	—	33
Percentile rank bands	4	1	2	—	—	2	—	3	3	8	—	2	4	5	—	14	—	4	3	3	4	—	—	3
Other	—	8	7	18	—	7	4	4	3	—	—	4	—	3	4	14	—	3	—	2	4	18	—	2
	Scholastic Aptitude, K-3						Scholastic Aptitude, 4-6						Scholastic Aptitude, 7-9						Scholastic Aptitude, 10-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Raw scores	19	13	16	18	100	16	14	13	14	14	80	14	42	32	26	28	50	34	30	23	30	12	—	25
I.Q. scores	91	92	86	87	100	90	82	89	87	76	60	85	62	59	68	74	50	63	77	82	81	80	100	80
Stanines	1	*	1	—	—	1	—	—	3	—	20	1	—	—	—	21	50	1	—	1	—	12	100	2
Standard scores	1	1	2	—	—	1	1	1	2	2	—	1	16	5	2	3	—	8	13	5	3	4	—	6
Grade equivalents	24	19	21	10	100	21	23	20	16	10	80	20	13	6	5	—	—	8	15	12	6	—	—	10
Age equivalents	23	29	27	26	100	27	14	30	27	24	60	25	11	7	5	—	—	7	11	17	13	—	—	12
Percentile ranks	29	26	26	18	100	26	28	30	25	17	100	28	54	55	62	56	100	56	40	28	44	28	100	36
Percentile rank bands	—	2	1	5	—	1	1	1	2	10	—	2	1	1	2	3	—	2	—	—	—	8	—	1
Other	1	2	4	3	—	2	1	1	4	5	—	2	1	3	1	3	—	2	—	—	—	4	—	*
	Achievement Batteries, K-3						Achievement Batteries, 4-6						Achievement Batteries, 7-8						Achievement Batteries, 9-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Raw scores	16	22	18	1	—	19	17	19	18	4	22	17	23	16	14	25	20	18	30	23	16	8	40	23
I.Q. scores	4	4	2	—	—	3	4	5	2	—	—	4	5	3	1	4	—	3	8	1	2	—	—	3
Stanines	8	25	27	9	5	21	3	10	15	8	33	9	6	5	4	13	—	5	1	—	1	1	—	—
Standard scores	6	15	10	1	—	11	7	8	9	5	—	8	19	12	8	18	—	13	46	42	47	57	—	45
Grade equivalents	82	84	85	39	6	84	79	86	85	90	78	84	58	60	40	54	40	60	6	4	7	2	40	5
Age equivalents	18	15	12	—	—	14	16	13	13	—	—	13	5	4	5	—	—	4	2	—	1	—	—	1
Percentile ranks	45	63	57	24	6	57	50	66	64	54	100	60	69	77	77	67	100	74	85	89	92	92	100	89
Percentile rank bands	2	1	—	1	—	1	2	3	1	5	—	2	7	—	—	—	—	2	4	3	5	2	—	3
Other	2	1	—	7	—	2	2	2	—	[illegible]	—	2	2	2	1	8	—	2	2	2	—	2	—	2

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 5-1 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Types of Test Scores

Percentages of school systems having various kinds of scores from various types of tests recorded in school records at selected grades.

In what form are the scores of this test recorded?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES											
	Reading Tests, 7-12						Multi-Aptitude Batteries, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Raw scores	28	6	15	31	—	16	42	42	39	48	67	42
I.Q. scores	2	1	—	4	—	1	6	3	—	—	—	3
Stanines	—	—	1	6	—	1	—	1	1	4	—	1
Standard scores	14	5	3	—	—	5	16	11	16	28	—	15
Grade equivalents	51	52	67	44	—	57	4	3	—	—	—	2
Age equivalents	14	18	21	—	—	16	1	—	1	—	—	1
Percentile ranks	44	55	41	44	—	46	82	88	93	96	100	89
Percentile rank bands	9	—	—	—	—	1	4	3	2	8	—	3
Other	11	3	1	17	—	5	1	1	—	4	—	1

	Interest Tests, 9						Interest Tests, 12						Personality Tests, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Raw scores	23	20	17	23	—	20	15	14	12	17	—	14	48	16	7	50	—	21
I.Q. scores	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Stanines	5	3	—	—	—	2	—	1	—	—	—	*	—	2	—	—	—	1
Standard scores	14	6	6	—	—	6	22	20	19	29	—	21	42	23	12	25	—	22
Grade equivalents	—	—	—	5	—	*	1	4	2	—	—	2	3	1	—	—	—	1
Age equivalents	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	*	3	1	—	—	—	1
Percentile ranks	45	55	69	45	—	58	16	18	17	14	—	17	39	24	28	—	—	26
Percentile rank bands	5	2	2	9	—	3	3	4	—	—	—	3	—	2	2	—	—	2
Other	9	17	10	27	—	15	36	31	41	31	—	35	9	25	37	—	—	24

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

with an accompanying decline in IQ scores, although these are still computed almost two-thirds of the time.

Grade equivalents are another type of score in disrepute with testing "experts." Nevertheless, grade equivalent scores are by far the most common form of test score for achievement batteries at the elementary level. It is not until senior high school that this score goes out of common use. Over 80 per cent of the achievement batteries in grades K-6 yield grade equivalent scores while only five per cent of achievement batteries in grades 9-12 do so. Percentile rank scores are very common at the elementary level although it is in senior high school where they are most prevalent with almost nine-tenths of the achievement battery scores recorded in terms of percentile rank scores.

Norm Groups

The responses to the question asking what norms are available for the use in interpreting test results are summarized in Table 5-2.

Elementary reading readiness and reading test results are most often compared with national norm groups although some school districts have prepared local norm for these tests. The larger school districts are much more apt to prepare local norms for reading tests than are the smaller systems.

Minnesota norms have been developed for all aptitude and achievement tests included in the Minnesota State-Wide Testing Program.* The Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Tests are offered in this program which accounts for the figure showing that half the schools have Minnesota norms for their scholastic aptitude tests at the junior high level. National norms are also in common use for scholastic aptitude tests at the secondary level and almost one-fourth of the high schools also have local norms.

More school systems have prepared local norms for their achievement batteries than for their scholastic aptitude tests. Fifteen per cent of the elementary schools and almost one-third of the secondary schools have local norms for their achievement batteries. National norms are in most common use through the end of junior high school but 70 per cent of the senior high schools report Minnesota norms for their achievement batteries because the Iowa Tests of Educational Development are included in the Minnesota State-Wide Testing Program. Almost 80 per cent of the schools have Minnesota norms for their multi-aptitude batteries because the same is true of the Differential Aptitude Tests.

---

*See Appendix XIV.

Reporting Test Results to Students

Practices of reporting test results to students are shown in Table 5-3.* In general there is a tendency to keep test results from students in the lower elementary grades. This is particularly true for aptitude-type tests where only rarely do younger pupils see their exact test results. As students get older there is greater likelihood that they will have an opportunity to see their test results or at least be given an interpretation of them.

Notice the differences at the kindergarten and first grade levels for reading readiness tests. Forty-two per cent of the users say these tests are not shown to the kindergarten students yet only 28 per cent shield them completely from first grade pupils.

It is not routine to report scholastic aptitude test results or even interpretations of these results to pupils at any grade level. Even in high school one-fourth of the users report that scholastic aptitude test results are completely confidential, and only about one-third of the schools say scholastic aptitude scores or interpretations thereof are routinely reported to all pupils.

The situation is quite different for achievement battery results which are much more apt to be reported to students. Further, the tendency is to report the actual scores themselves rather than interpretations. Well over half of Minnesota high school students see their actual achievement battery scores.

Interest test scores are generally available to students, particularly at the ninth grade level where 84 per cent of the interest test results are seen by students.

Although actual profiles are used somewhat less often with seniors, almost three-fourths of the students have access to them.

---

*The responses for the third and fourth alternatives to this item are contaminated by an error in the elementary questionnaire which listed "No, but interpretative explanations are given in some cases." for both responses 3 and 4. "No, but interpretative explanations are routinely given to all children," should have been the choice for response 3 and was correctly printed in the secondary questionnaire.

TABLE 5-2

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Norm Groups Available

Percentages of school systems having various kinds of norms available for various types of tests at selected grades.

What norms do you have available for use in interpreting the scores from this test?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Reading Readiness, K						Reading Readiness, 1						Reading, K-3						Reading, 4-6					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Local	12	3	15	18	—	9	11	11	17	38	25	15	2	3	33	33	—	12	1	4	17	24	—	6
Minnesota	—	—	2	—	—	1	2	1	—	—	—	1	1	3	—	—	—	2	4	3	3	—	—	3
Regional	—	4	2	—	—	2	2	8	3	—	—	5	2	5	2	—	—	3	—	4	—	—	—	2
National	54	85	87	82	—	81	54	64	67	69	100	63	65	71	73	86	100	71	67	74	63	76	—	70
Other	—	1	—	—	—	1	4	4	3	—	—	4	—	7	—	—	—	3	—	6	3	—	—	3
None	—	5	—	9	—	3	7	6	3	—	—	5	7	8	3	33	—	7	7	7	4	18	—	7
	Scholastic Aptitude, K-3						Scholastic Aptitude, 4-6						Scholastic Aptitude, 7-9						Scholastic Aptitude, 10-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Local	2	7	16	21	—	9	1	8	18	29	20	10	16	16	39	67	50	24	15	20	20	52	—	25
Minnesota	7	1	1	—	—	3	7	*	1	7	20	3	62	48	44	41	—	51	32	17	16	12	—	20
Regional	3	1	5	3	—	2	1	2	5	2	—	2	2	2	1	—	—	2	2	5	—	—	—	2
National	65	76	70	87	100	72	66	71	73	88	100	72	45	51	67	74	50	54	43	65	75	88	100	65
Other	3	2	3	—	—	2	1	2	3	—	—	2	—	—	1	—	—	*	—	—	6	—	—	2
None	6	4	1	5	—	4	7	5	1	2	—	5	3	9	1	—	—	5	21	8	2	—	—	8
	Achievement Batteries, K-3						Achievement Batteries, 4-6						Achievement Batteries, 7-8						Achievement Batteries, 9-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Local	5	10	27	51	17	15	4	10	28	56	67	15	19	27	42	67	20	31	17	26	58	73	40	33
Minnesota	9	4	2	—	—	4	9	6	2	—	—	5	19	22	20	13	—	20	75	75	59	61	20	70
Regional	9	8	6	7	17	8	8	12	13	11	33	11	8	10	6	4	40	8	2	4	3	—	—	3
National	69	82	85	96	100	80	69	81	77	93	100	77	79	72	82	79	60	77	47	45	63	65	80	51
Other	1	1	2	—	—	1	1	1	2	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—
None	2	1	—	—	—	1	2	1	—	—	—	1	—	2	—	—	—	1	—	1	1	—	—	1

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 5-2 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Norm Groups Available

Percentages of school systems having various kinds of norms available for various types of tests at selected grades.

What norms do you have available for use in interpreting the scores from this test?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES											
	Reading Tests, 7-12						Multi-Aptitude Batteries, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Local	12	15	19	27	—	18	10	21	44	72	33	27
Minnesota	11	3	1	—	—	3	79	79	82	72	67	79
Regional	—	1	3	—	—	1	2	1	—	4	—	1
National	79	83	80	85	—	81	34	28	30	52	100	32
Other	—	1	3	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
None	5	5	—	6	—	3	2	3	1	—	—	2

	Interest Tests, 9						Interest Tests, 12						Personality Tests, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Local	14	1	4	—	—	3	2	2	1	—	—	2	6	9	5	—	—	7
Minnesota	18	2	2	—	—	4	18	11	8	6	—	12	61	26	12	8	—	27
Regional	—	2	2	—	—	2	2	—	1	—	—	1	9	1	—	—	—	2
National	41	65	74	73	—	67	39	60	66	63	—	55	21	45	49	42	—	42
Other	—	1	1	—	—	1	1	—	6	6	—	2	—	—	14	—	—	4
None	23	12	7	9	—	11	19	11	4	—	—	11	21	12	12	50	—	16

The most common procedure for handling personality test results in the high school is to give interpretive explanations of the results in some but not all cases.

Reporting Test Results to Parents

School practices of reporting pupil test results to parents are found in Table 5-4. There is greater willingness to report the results of reading readiness tests to parents than to the pupils. There is also greater willingness to provide parents with the actual scores than is the case with their children, who are more apt to get interpretations only. Few schools keep reading readiness scores completely confidential from parents.

The same pattern holds for reading tests in the lower elementary grades although in the upper elementary grades there is equal willingness to provide both parents and pupils with actual reading test scores. These tables also show that schools more commonly communicate reading test results to each pupil than they do to every parent.

The schools seem to be willing to interpret scholastic aptitude test scores to parents provided the parents ask for information. However, there does not seem to be much attempt to insure that scholastic aptitude test results become known to all parents. The practices of reporting scholastic aptitude test results to parents are almost identical across all grade levels. Some differences in approach are found in schools of different size where we find that the smaller systems are much more apt to keep the scholastic aptitude test results from parents, considering them completely confidential.

Practices of reporting achievement battery results to parents are quite consistent over all grade levels with the exception that the elementary schools are more apt to make an effort to communicate these results to all parents whereas the secondary schools are again more prone to wait for the parents to take the initiative in seeking results. There is very little tendency to keep achievement battery results completely confidential from parents.

Parents are not nearly so likely to see their children's interest inventory profiles as are the children themselves. Apparently the ninth grade profiles are more commonly provided to parents

TABLE 5-3

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Reporting Test Score to Children

Percentages of school systems with various practices of reporting various types of test results to children at selected grades.

Are scores reported to children?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Reading Readiness, K						Reading Readiness, 1						Reading, K-3						Reading, 4-6					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Yes, scores are reported routinely to all children	—	6	2	—	—	3	4	13	13	—	—	9	19	8	14	10	—	13	20	11	24	—	—	16
Yes, scores are reported in some cases	4	6	—	—	—	3	4	11	7	—	—	7	20	16	9	10	—	15	13	21	5	18	—	16
No, but interpretative explanations are routinely given to all children	35	29	31	36	—	31	43	35	37	54	75	40	32	33	34	19	—	32	33	27	40	29	—	31
No, but interpretative explanations are given in some cases	23	11	15	18	—	15	7	10	13	—	—	9	17	19	23	10	100	19	21	21	19	35	—	21
No, test performance is completely confidential	38	42	45	36	—	42	33	28	27	31	25	28	11	17	14	52	—	17	10	14	7	18	—	12
No Response	—	5	6	9	—	5	9	4	3	15	—	6	2	6	5	—	—	4	3	5	5	—	—	5
	Scholastic Aptitude, K-3						Scholastic Aptitude, 4-6						Scholastic Aptitude, 7-9						Scholastic Aptitude, 10-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Yes, scores are reported routinely to all children	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	20	*	8	9	8	8	50	8	2	—	10	4	—	4
Yes, scores are reported in some cases	2	2	2	—	—	2	3	4	1	—	—	2	7	4	5	8	—	5	8	5	8	4	—	6
No, but interpretative explanations are routinely given to all children	20	24	18	36	100	23	19	24	24	43	60	25	20	16	31	21	—	21	23	21	13	12	100	13
No, but interpretative explanations are given in some cases	6	9	12	13	—	9	5	9	18	12	20	10	27	43	38	43	50	37	34	38	59	52	—	45
No, test performance is completely confidential	69	62	65	44	—	63	69	60	50	33	—	58	38	27	17	21	—	28	32	33	11	20	—	25
No Response	2	3	3	8	—	3	4	3	5	12	—	5	1	1	1	—	—	1	2	3	—	8	—	2

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 5-3 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Reporting Test Scores to Children

Percentages of school systems with various practices of reporting various types of test results to children at selected grades.

Are scores reported to children?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Achievement Batteries, K-3						Achievement Batteries, 4-6						Achievement Batteries, 7-8						Achievement Batteries, 9-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Yes, scores are reported routinely to all children	23	20	19	13	17	20	26	31	40	14	67	31	49	49	58	38	40	50	55	63	69	59	40	62
Yes, scores are reported in some cases	9	10	11	9	—	10	7	8	6	7	11	7	8	11	10	21	—	11	11	7	8	8	—	8
No, but interpretative explanations are routinely given to all children	35	33	33	49	83	35	35	32	29	48	—	33	21	15	20	25	20	19	16	17	15	18	—	16
No, but interpretative explanations are given in some cases	9	15	14	13	—	13	11	17	15	20	22	15	20	18	12	13	40	17	17	12	7	6	60	12
No, test performance is completely confidential	20	19	22	11	—	19	16	10	7	11	—	11	—	2	—	—	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	1
No Response	3	3	2	4	—	3	4	2	2	—	—	2	2	4	—	4	—	2	1	—	2	8	—	1

	Reading Tests, 7-12						Multi-Aptitude Batteries, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Yes, scores are reported routinely to all children	37	36	46	33	—	40	33	53	57	44	33	48
Yes, scores are reported in some cases	7	12	16	21	—	14	11	6	8	12	—	8
No, but interpretative explanations are routinely given to all children	23	18	13	19	—	17	19	17	25	28	67	21
No, but interpretative explanations are given in some cases	33	28	23	13	—	25	29	18	10	16	—	19
No, test performance is completely confidential	—	4	1	6	—	3	5	3	—	—	—	3
No Response	—	2	—	8	—	2	2	2	—	—	—	1

TABLE 5-3 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Reporting Test Scores to Children

Percentages of school systems with various practices of reporting various types of test results to children at selected grades.

Are scores reported to children?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																	
	Interest Tests, 9						Interest Tests, 12						Personality Tests, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Yes, scores are reported routinely to all children	82	89	81	77	—	84	77	76	75	43	—	74	18	22	20	—	—	19
Yes, scores are reported in some cases	—	2	4	5	—	3	5	4	2	20	—	5	24	—	12	—	—	8
No, but interpretative explanations are routinely given to all children	9	4	10	18	—	8	11	12	18	17	—	13	27	14	12	—	—	14
No, but interpretative explanations are given in some cases	—	1	1	—	—	1	6	4	5	—	—	4	21	35	47	67	—	38
No, test performance is completely confidential	5	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	27	8	33	—	18
No Response	5	3	4	—	—	3	1	4	—	20	—	3	3	1	—	—	—	2

than are interest profiles of seniors although the table does not reveal any unwillingness to discuss student's interest inventory profiles with the parents.

Little attempt is made to communicate personality test results to parents although schools are willing to discuss these results with parents if the parents so request. Eighteen per cent of the schools say that personality test results are completely confidential, however.

Multi-aptitude battery scores or interpretations of them are provided to about 70 per cent of senior high students, but less than one-third of the parents receive this information.

Who Interprets Test Results to Parents and Children

Teachers clearly have the primary responsibility for interpreting reading readiness and reading test results to parents and students although principals have this responsibility in some cases (Table 5-5).

At the elementary level, teachers have primary responsibility for interpreting scholastic aptitude tests although, as noted above, scholastic aptitude tests are less often interpreted to students and parents than other kinds of tests. In high school, counselors take over as the persons most apt to interpret scholastic aptitude test results to pupil and parents. This, of course, is a function of school size and the interpretation of scholastic aptitude tests is usually done by the principal in the smaller systems which do not have counselors. In marked contrast to their colleagues at the elementary level, high school teachers seldom interpret scholastic aptitude test results to students or parents.

Teachers also have primary responsibility for interpretation of achievement batteries at the elementary level while guidance counselors have this responsibility at the secondary level and the principal fills in in the small systems without counselors. Achievement batteries are less apt to be kept confidential, however.

Counselors are heavily involved in the interpretation of interest test scores to pupils and parents. Ninth grade classroom teachers tend to do more interest test interpretation than other high school teachers. Undoubtedly these are teachers of the "occupational unit" during which most interest tests are administered to freshmen. Notice that teachers or principals do over

TABLE 5-4

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Reporting of Test Scores to Parents

Percentages of school systems with various practices of reporting various types of test results to parents at selected grades.

Are scores reported to parents?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Reading Readiness, K						Reading Readiness, 1						Reading, K-3						Reading, 4-6					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Yes, scores are reported routinely to all parents	8	14	15	18	—	13	11	19	10	23	75	17	9	8	12	14	—	10	9	7	11	—	—	8
Yes, scores are reported on parents' request and/or if school feels desirable	19	17	22	9	—	19	24	24	27	31	—	24	28	27	28	19	—	27	17	27	29	18	—	24
No, but interpretative explanations are routinely reported to all parents	12	10	9	36	—	12	17	15	17	23	—	16	6	8	27	43	—	14	9	13	21	18	—	14
No, but interpretative explanations are given and/or if school feels desirable	58	47	55	36	—	51	37	36	43	15	25	36	52	48	31	24	100	44	54	47	39	59	—	48
No, test performance is completely confidential	4	6	—	—	—	3	7	3	3	8	—	4	—	3	2	—	—	2	3	4	—	—	—	3
No Response	—	5	—	—	—	2	4	3	—	—	—	2	5	5	—	—	—	3	7	2	—	6	—	3
	Scholastic Aptitude, K-3						Scholastic Aptitude, 4-6						Scholastic Aptitude, 7-9						Scholastic Aptitude, 10-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Yes, scores are reported routinely to all parents	1	1	1	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	20	1	3	2	1	—	50	2	—	—	2	—	—	1
Yes, scores are reported on parents' request and/or if school feels desirable	6	6	4	5	—	6	7	8	5	7	—	7	18	16	12	13	—	15	13	12	16	12	100	14
No, but interpretative explanations are routinely reported to all parents	5	8	7	31	100	8	5	8	5	31	60	9	9	6	10	3	—	8	17	5	3	—	—	7
No, but interpretative explanations are given and/or if school feels desirable	44	57	59	59	—	54	46	55	64	52	20	54	45	62	67	77	50	57	47	55	67	64	—	57
No, test performance is completely confidential	42	24	25	5	—	28	38	25	23	7	—	26	24	14	10	8	—	16	21	26	13	24	—	20
No Response	2	4	4	—	—	3	3	4	4	2	—	3	1	1	1	—	—	1	2	3	—	—	—	1

TABLE 5-4 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Reporting of Test Scores to Parents

Percentages of school systems with various practices of reporting various types of test results to parents at selected grades.

Are scores reported to parents?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Achievement Batteries, K-3						Achievement Batteries, 4-6						Achievement Batteries, 7-8						Achievement Batteries, 9-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Yes, scores are reported routinely to all parents	24	21	26	29	67	24	30	32	38	37	67	33	42	40	33	17	40	37	26	32	35	37	40	31
Yes, scores are reported on parents' request and/or if school feels desirable	8	17	21	13	33	15	9	13	17	11	—	13	19	23	27	29	40	23	33	24	24	31	20	27
No, but interpretative explanations are routinely reported to all parents	23	18	15	31	—	19	23	21	16	33	11	21	5	8	5	17	—	7	8	8	9	6	—	8
No, but interpretative explanations are given and/or if school feels desirable	40	40	38	27	—	39	33	32	28	19	22	30	33	28	36	33	20	32	32	35	30	27	40	32
No, test performance is completely confidential	3	1	—	—	—	1	4	1	—	—	—	2	—	2	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	*
No Response	1	2	—	—	—	1	2	1	—	—	—	1	2	—	—	4	—	1	—	2	2	—	—	1

Are scores reported to parents?	Reading Tests, 7-12						Multi-Aptitude Batteries, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Yes, scores are reported routinely to all parents	9	3	8	4	—	6	13	17	27	20	33	19
Yes, scores are reported on parents' request and/or if school feels desirable	37	28	25	38	—	29	23	25	19	20	33	22
No, but interpretative explanations are routinely reported to all parents	11	3	3	2	—	4	7	10	13	16	—	10
No, but interpretative explanations are given and/or if school feels desirable	44	59	63	52	—	57	55	45	39	44	33	46
No, test performance is completely confidential	—	6	2	4	—	3	1	2	1	—	—	1
No Response	—	1	—	—	—	*	1	1	1	—	—	1

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 5-4 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Reporting of Test Scores to Parents

Percentages of school systems with various practices of reporting various types of test results to parents at selected grades.

Are scores reported to parents?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																	
	Interest Tests, 9						Interest Tests, 12						Personality Tests, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Yes, scores are reported routinely to all parents	36	24	44	18	—	32	22	14	21	11	—	18	3	3	3	—	—	3
Yes, scores are reported on parents' request and/or if school feels desirable	23	25	20	32	—	23	40	29	24	40	—	32	42	10	19	—	—	18
No, but interpretative explanations are routinely reported to all parents	23	11	7	9	—	11	6	4	6	—	—	5	6	6	—	—	—	4
No, but interpretative explanations are given and/or if school feels desirable	14	38	23	41	—	30	30	50	44	43	—	42	36	57	59	22	—	56
No, test performance is completely confidential	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	2	6	—	1	9	34	19	8	—	18
No Response	5	3	4	—	—	3	2	2	3	—	—	2	3	1	—	—	—	1

three-fourths of the interest test interpretation in the small systems.

Staffing as a function of school size is also important in determining who will interpret personality test results to parents and pupils. For example, half of the personality tests administered in the suburban schools are interpreted by a school psychologist. On the other hand, two-thirds of the personality tests administered in the small school systems are interpreted by the high school principal.

Availability of Test Scores to Teachers

The list of possible responses to the question, "Are scores available to teachers?" attempts to discover where the results for various kinds of tests are kept and, further, whether or not teachers have to consult with a principal or pupil personnel worker in obtaining scores. Table 5-6 tabulates these replies.

Reading readiness and reading test results are typically kept in teachers' files. An additional one-fifth of the schools report that scores for these tests are kept in a central file. Less than five per cent of the reading readiness and reading test scores are available through consultation with a principal or a pupil personnel worker only.

The general practice for the filing of scholastic aptitude test results is to keep them in teachers' files in the elementary schools and in the central office files in the secondary schools. This is true in about two-thirds of the school systems. Another one-fourth of the scholastic aptitude tests in the elementary schools are kept in the central files and a little over 10 per cent of these tests are kept in the teachers' files in high schools. This table shows that there is over twice as much opportunity for consultation about test results at the secondary level than is the case at the elementary level.

The pattern for storage of achievement battery results in elementary schools differs from that for scholastic aptitude tests in that three-fourths of the achievement battery results are kept in teachers' files, whereas only one-third of the scholastic aptitude test results are in the hands of teachers. High school teachers are also more apt to have achievement than scholastic aptitude test results in their files, although the central office file

TABLE 5-5

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Who Interprets Test Results

Percentages of school systems using various staff members to interpret the results of various types of tests to parents and/or pupils at selected grades.

Who is most likely to interpret scores to parents and/or children?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Reading Readiness, K						Reading Readiness, 1						Reading, K-3						Reading, 4-6					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Classroom teacher	81	63	64	91	—	67	85	79	77	100	25	81	79	59	76	81	100	70	68	50	65	71	—	59
Guidance counselor	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	12	—	1
School psychologist	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Principal or assistant principal	8	8	13	9	—	9	—	3	7	—	—	2	5	8	6	—	—	6	9	9	8	—	—	8
Teachers and/or principal	8	20	15	—	—	15	—	13	7	—	75	8	7	25	16	—	—	16	8	25	12	—	—	16
Teachers and/or counselor	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Counselor and/or principal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	5	1	1	10	—	2	6	7	12	18	—	8
These scores not interpreted	4	8	5	—	—	6	4	3	7	—	—	4	2	3	—	10	—	2	3	4	3	—	—	3
No Response	—	1	4	—	—	2	11	1	3	—	—	4	4	3	1	—	—	3	6	3	—	—	—	4

	Scholastic Aptitude, K-3						Scholastic Aptitude, 4-6						Scholastic Aptitude, 7-9						Scholastic Aptitude, 10-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Classroom teacher	56	50	44	67	100	51	58	49	40	64	80	51	5	3	—	—	—	3	11	—	—	—	—	3
Guidance counselor	1	2	1	—	—	1	1	2	2	7	—	2	9	46	82	87	50	44	8	37	90	80	100	50
School psychologist	—	1	—	5	—	1	—	*	1	2	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Principal or assistant principal	5	14	17	15	—	12	5	15	22	14	—	13	57	32	7	—	—	32	57	39	2	—	—	28
Teachers and/or principal	2	11	18	5	—	10	1	11	14	5	20	8	10	1	—	—	—	4	9	—	—	—	—	2
Teachers and/or counselor	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	*
Counselor and/or principal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	4	2	3	—	3	2	1	—	—	—	1
Other	1	*	—	—	—	1	—	3	—	—	—	1	3	1	—	—	50	2	—	—	3	20	—	3
These scores not interpreted	22	16	16	8	—	17	23	15	16	7	—	17	11	12	9	10	—	11	11	15	5	—	—	10
No Response	13	7	5	—	—	7	13	5	6	—	—	7	2	—	1	—	—	1	2	6	—	—	—	3

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 5-5 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Who Interprets Test Results

Percentages of school systems using various staff members to interpret the results of various types of tests to parents and/or pupils at selected grades.

Who is most likely to interpret scores to parents and/or children?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Achievement Batteries, K-3						Achievement Batteries, 4-6						Achievement Batteries, 7-8						Achievement Batteries, 9-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Classroom teacher	79	71	71	96	50	74	81	74	73	92	67	77	21	15	7	—	—	13	5	2	1	—	—	3
Guidance counselor	—	1	—	—	—	1	2	1	—	1	—	1	7	37	84	79	100	45	16	52	95	88	100	52
School psychologist	—	—	3	—	—	1	—	—	2	—	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Principal or assistant principal	4	4	9	2	—	5	4	3	6	4	—	4	50	33	4	—	—	27	63	33	2	—	—	34
Teachers and/or principal	10	21	16	2	50	16	8	18	18	4	33	14	14	5	—	8	—	6	9	3	—	—	—	4
Teachers and/or counselor	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	2	—	—	2	—	2	—	8	—	1
Counselor and/or principal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	5	1	4	—	3	3	5	—	2	—	3
Other	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	1	2	1	—	—	—	1	2	1	—	2	—	2
These scores not interpreted	3	2	—	—	—	2	2	2	—	—	—	2	1	—	—	—	—	*	—	1	—	—	—	4
No Response	3	1	1	—	—	1	2	1	1	—	—	1	2	2	1	8	—	2	1	1	1	—	—	1

	Reading Tests, 7-12						Multi-Aptitude Batteries, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Classroom teacher	26	16	21	19	—	19	1	1	3	—	—	2
Guidance counselor	7	47	56	67	—	46	20	63	93	84	67	61
School psychologist	—	9	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—
Principal or assistant principal	28	15	1	—	—	9	64	23	1	—	—	24
Teachers and/or principal	12	—	—	—	—	2	11	1	—	4	—	4
Teachers and/or counselor	—	1	3	4	—	2	—	1	—	4	—	1
Counselor and/or principal	5	—	—	—	—	1	1	6	—	4	—	3
Other	21	6	14	10	—	12	2	1	2	—	33	2
These scores not interpreted	—	6	2	—	—	3	—	1	—	—	—	1
No Response	—	1	3	—	—	2	1	2	—	4	—	1

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 5-5 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Who Interprets Test Results

Percentages of school systems using various staff members to interpret the results of various types of tests to parents and/or pupils at selected grades.

Who is most likely to interpret scores to parents and/or children?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																	
	Interest Tests, 9						Interest Tests, 12						Personality Tests, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Classroom teacher	32	18	14	14	—	17	—	3	3	3	—	2	6	5	5	—	—	4
Guidance counselor	27	55	74	68	—	61	14	53	92	91	—	51	6	53	80	25	—	52
School psychologist	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	7	50	—	7
Principal or assistant principal	32	13	1	—	—	9	70	34	3	—	—	37	64	14	—	—	—	17
Teachers and/or principal	5	2	—	—	—	1	8	1	—	—	—	3	9	—	—	—	—	2
Teachers and/or counselor	—	8	6	18	—	7	—	3	2	—	—	2	—	2	—	—	—	1
Counselor and/or principal	—	2	—	—	—	1	5	3	—	—	—	3	9	1	—	—	—	2
Other	—	—	1	—	—	1	2	1	1	6	—	2	—	1	3	25	—	4
These scores not interpreted	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	18	5	—	—	10
No Response	5	2	4	—	—	3	1	2	—	—	—	1	—	*	—	—	—	1

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

is by far the most likely location for achievement battery results in high school. Again we see that there is much more possibility for consultation in the use of achievement test results in high school than at the elementary level.

Although it seldom happens that interest inventory results are kept in high school teachers' files these results are available in the central file or by talking with the principal or counselor. Very few schools feel that interest test results should be kept confidential from teachers.

Only rarely are personality test results kept in teachers' files in high school. Personality test results are available in the central file of 40 per cent of the users and they can be obtained only in consultation with the principal or personnel worker in another 40 per cent of the cases. School size and the availability of personnel again influence practice, the usual case being that the personality results can be obtained in the central office files of small systems having such scores but are available only through consultation with trained personnel in the large systems.

Use of Test Results

The use of test results is of utmost interest and concern for every educator, particularly those having responsibility for the operation of a testing program. All agree it is a waste of school time and money to administer tests which are not used effectively. Data in Chapter 7 indicate that schools generally feel they would like to make better use of their test results while tables in this chapter show how schools say they now use their results. The percentages of systems saying test results are used for one or more of the seven listed purposes are presented in Table 5-7.* This question cannot always be answered on a purely factual basis and these tables are bound to reflect the personal opinions and preceptions of the respondents to a certain extent.

Reading readiness tests in kindergarten and first grade seem to be used most often for grouping pupils and for diagnosis of learning difficulties. The larger school systems are more apt to use the results for grouping at the first grade level than the smaller systems and are much more apt to use the reading

---

*The columns in these tables may total more than 100 per cent since the schools were asked to indicate all of the ways in which the test results are used.

TABLE 5-6

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Availability of Scores to Teachers

Percentage of school systems reporting various practices of making various types of test results available to teachers at selected grades.

Are scores available to teachers?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Reading Readiness, K						Reading Readiness, 1						Reading, K-3						Reading, 4-6					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Yes, teachers have scores in their files	58	74	85	91	—	76	67	68	90	92	100	75	56	69	91	100	100	72	56	72	80	82	—	69
Yes, teachers can get scores by consulting central files	42	20	11	9	—	20	24	22	10	—	—	18	37	27	9	—	—	24	29	22	16	18	—	23
Yes, teachers can get scores in consultation with principal or pupil personnel worker	—	6	4	—	—	4	4	7	—	—	—	4	3	1	—	—	—	1	9	4	3	—	—	5
No, test performance is completely confidential	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	3	—	8	—	3	4	3	—	—	—	2	7	2	1	—	—	3

	Scholastic Aptitude, K-3						Scholastic Aptitude, 4-6						Scholastic Aptitude, 7-9						Scholastic Aptitude, 10-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Yes, teachers have scores in their files	49	68	81	90	—	67	50	66	81	88	40	66	5	13	15	23	50	11	8	6	16	36	—	13
Yes, teachers can get scores by consulting central files	41	20	14	8	—	24	34	21	14	7	—	22	63	59	66	64	50	62	72	64	71	48	100	66
Yes, teachers can get scores in consultation with principal or pupil personnel worker	8	8	3	—	—	7	12	10	3	2	—	9	29	27	17	13	—	24	19	28	13	16	—	20
No, test performance is completely confidential	—	*	—	—	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	2	2	2	3	100	2	4	3	2	2	60	3	2	—	2	—	—	1	2	1	1	—	—	1

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 5-6 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Availability of Scores to Teachers

Percentage of school systems reporting various practices of making various types of test results available to teachers at selected grades.

Are scores available to teachers?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Achievement Batteries, K-3						Achievement Batteries, 4-6						Achievement Batteries, 7-8						Achievement Batteries, 9-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Yes, teachers have scores in their files	63	74	81	91	100	74	58	73	85	94	100	73	12	28	27	46	60	25	13	15	30	41	80	20
Yes, teachers can get scores by consulting central files	32	17	13	9	—	19	34	19	11	6	—	21	62	50	59	42	40	55	65	65	59	53	20	63
Yes, teachers can get scores in consultation with principal or pupil personnel worker	4	7	6	—	—	6	6	6	4	—	—	5	21	19	13	8	—	17	21	18	10	4	—	16
No, test performance is completely confidential	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	1	1	—	—	—	1	2	1	1	—	—	1	6	—	1	4	—	2	—	1	1	2	—	1

	Reading Tests, 7-12						Multi-Aptitude Batteries, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Yes, teachers have scores in their files	—	23	30	52	—	26	7	15	23	36	33	16
Yes, teachers can get scores by consulting central files	49	42	60	33	—	49	59	61	66	52	67	61
Yes, teachers can get scores in consultation with principal or pupil personnel worker	51	32	9	15	—	23	31	21	11	12	—	21
No, test performance is completely confidential	—	2	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	1
No Response	—	1	1	—	—	1	2	1	—	—	—	1

TABLE 5-6 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Availability of Scores to Teachers

Percentage of school systems reporting various practices of making various types of test results available to teachers at selected grades.

Are scores available to teachers?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																	
	Interest Tests, 9						Interest Tests, 12						Personality Tests, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Yes, teachers have scores in their files	9	8	6	14	—	8	5	5	3	11	—	5	—	3	5	—	—	3
Yes, teachers can get scores by consulting central files	64	68	74	77	—	71	62	62	72	63	—	64	67	37	37	17	—	41
Yes, teachers can get scores in consultation with principal or pupil personnel worker	23	22	11	9	—	16	30	29	24	26	—	28	24	34	51	75	—	40
No, test performance is completely confidential	—	1	2	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	23	5	8	—	12
No Response	5	2	6	—	—	4	3	4	2	—	—	3	9	2	2	—	—	3

readiness test results for counseling with parents than do the smaller systems.

Reading tests in the elementary schools are most often used for the diagnosis of learning difficulties although one-half of the schools report using their reading tests for grouping and one-third use the results for counseling with parents and students. Almost 90 per cent of the schools use reading tests for the diagnosis of learning difficulties at the secondary level and two-thirds say they use these test scores for counseling with pupils. Slightly less than one-half say reading tests in high school are used for grouping and for counseling with parents.

Scholastic aptitude test results are used for the diagnosis of learning difficulties and for counseling with parents by about half the users at all grade levels and for homogeneous grouping by about one-third of the schools.

There are considerable differences between elementary and high schools in the uses of scholastic aptitude test results for counseling students. About one-third of the elementary schools report they use scholastic aptitude test results for counseling students in contrast to over 85 per cent of the high schools. At the same time slightly more high school users also say they use these results for diagnosing learning difficulties and counseling parents. The higher incidence of using scholastic aptitude test results in counseling with students and parents in the larger school systems likely results from the fact that the larger schools are more apt to have counselors. It is not clear, however, why the larger systems should also be using the results more often for the diagnosis of learning difficulties.

Achievement batteries are used extensively for the diagnosis of learning difficulties and more elementary schools report this use of achievement batteries than do secondary schools. Unlike the situation in the use of scholastic aptitude tests, the smaller elementary school systems are more likely to use achievement batteries for the diagnosis of learning difficulties than are the larger systems. Almost half of the schools report the use of achievement test results for the evaluation of curriculum with the larger systems more likely to use achievement batteries for this purpose than the smaller systems. Obviously one of the most important uses for achievement battery results is counseling students. This seems to be true even at the elementary level where we find that well over one-third of the schools report this use.*

Counseling students is the most common use of interest inventory results and almost one-half of the schools using interest inventories report that the results are also used for counseling with parents. The larger systems are much more apt to talk with parents about their children's interest test scores than are their colleagues in the smaller systems. This is particularly noteworthy when one considers that the possibility for contact between the school and the parents in the small towns is, theoretically, much greater than in the large cities and suburbs.

Personality test results are used for counseling with both students and parents and at about the same rate as was the case with interest inventories. Almost one-third of the schools are saying they use personality tests to help in the diagnosis of learning difficulties.

Counseling with students is also the use selected most often for the results of multi-aptitude batteries with diagnosis of learning difficulties and counseling with parents indicated by over half the schools.

The total impression of these tables calls to attention a broad generalization about differences between the elementary and secondary levels in uses of test results—high schools report considerably more uses from their test results than elementary schools. In cases where a particular test type is used across all grade levels, the high schools report about half again as many different uses for their results. Much of this difference can, no doubt, again be attributed to the presence of counselors in the high schools. Counselors certainly should make good use of test results in their work with students and they should also be instrumental in helping teachers and administrators make better use of test results.

---

*The very high number of schools reporting "counseling students" as one use of test results may be influenced by the fact that the Minnesota State-Wide Testing Programs are operated by the Student Counseling Bureau at the University of Minnesota. While other instructional and administrative uses of tests have not been neglected, these Programs have historically emphasized assistance to counselors.

Another comment about the wording of the question itself is appropriate at this point. It now seems evident that a response or two which would have allowed schools to report more instructional uses of test results would have greatly improved the quality of this particular item. For example, an alternative such as "to individualize instruction" would have broadened the scope of the item and may have softened the heavy emphasis on the counseling use of test results.

Most Important Use of Test Results

In addition to reporting all of the ways in which they use test results, schools were also asked to report the *single* most important use of the results from each type of test and these responses are presented in Table 5-8.

There is an interesting reversal between kindergarten and grade one in the most important use of reading readiness test results. At kindergarten, homogeneous grouping is the use chosen most, followed by the diagnosis of learning difficulties. At first grade, the diagnosis of learning difficulties becomes the most important single use. Notice that the larger systems are more apt to use reading readiness test results for grouping and less apt to use them for the diagnosis of learning difficulties.

The diagnosis of learning difficulties is clearly the most important use for reading tests at all levels. Only half as many schools choose grouping, the second most selected choice.

Although the diagnosis of learning difficulties is most often reported as the most important use of scholastic aptitude tests at the elementary level, a significant number of schools also believe that homogeneous grouping and counseling with pupils are the most important; and at least a few schools choose each of the other possibilities. A substantial change in the schools' choices of the most important use for scholastic aptitude tests occurs at the secondary level where over two-thirds say counseling with the students is the most important single use for this type of test. As is true with this particular response for other types of tests, "counseling with students" is a function of the availability of counselors and, ultimately, of school size.

The diagnosis of learning difficulties is perceived as the most important use for results of achievement batteries almost twice as often as is the case with scholastic aptitude tests. Achievement battery results are less often used for homogeneous grouping and for counseling with students at the elementary level while at the secondary level the counseling of students is as important a use of achievement batteries as it is of scholastic aptitude tests.

TABLE 5-7

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Use of Test Results

Percentages of school systems reporting various uses for test results from various types of tests at selected grades.

How are your test results used? Indicate all the ways in which you use each test.	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Reading Readiness, K						Reading Readiness, 1						Reading, K-3						Reading, 4-6					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Homogeneous ability grouping of students by classes or within classes	58	53	56	55	—	55	61	65	57	85	25	63	48	58	58	76	100	56	53	49	51	53	—	51
Counseling students	15	18	24	18	—	19	15	13	30	23	100	19	38	22	46	38	100	34	32	22	51	24	—	31
Grading students	—	4	5	18	—	5	2	10	3	—	25	6	7	4	8	29	100	8	9	6	12	18	—	9
To evaluate curriculum	15	23	22	18	—	21	11	25	30	23	100	24	24	28	48	33	100	32	23	23	32	24	—	25
To evaluate teaching staff	4	5	2	—	—	3	4	6	—	—	—	4	7	3	—	—	—	3	7	2	—	—	—	3
Diagnosing learning difficulties	62	63	58	55	—	60	70	63	57	46	75	62	85	69	68	86	—	74	81	68	83	94	—	76
Counseling parents	38	46	51	64	—	48	28	35	40	69	100	38	26	36	46	71	100	38	34	27	57	76	—	37
Other	—	4	9	—	—	5	—	6	—	—	—	2	4	7	3	—	—	5	5	7	5	—	—	6
These test results are not used	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

	Scholastic Aptitude, K-3						Scholastic Aptitude, 4-6						Scholastic Aptitude, 7-9						Scholastic Aptitude, 10-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Homogeneous ability grouping of students by classes or within classes	35	42	31	49	—	38	25	40	27	40	20	33	12	39	54	59	50	35	19	19	49	48	—	31
Counseling students	29	26	33	41	100	29	31	32	41	40	100	35	77	86	93	90	100	85	75	87	92	96	100	87
Grading students	4	8	9	8	—	7	4	8	10	14	80	9	5	4	10	13	—	6	8	4	11	4	—	7
To evaluate curriculum	8	7	7	3	—	7	13	11	6	5	40	10	14	17	18	13	—	16	4	12	4	8	—	7
To evaluate teaching staff	2	3	1	—	—	2	3	2	1	—	—	2	2	3	4	—	—	3	4	4	—	—	—	2
Diagnosing learning difficulties	51	54	52	54	—	53	46	52	50	48	20	50	56	63	69	54	100	62	47	44	60	68	100	52
Counseling parents	35	37	47	69	100	41	35	38	45	74	100	42	43	48	61	62	100	50	26	48	70	88	100	54
Other	5	7	9	10	—	7	3	8	13	10	—	8	1	2	1	13	—	2	2	3	2	—	—	2
These test results are not used	2	*	2	—	—	1	3	*	3	—	—	2	3	1	1	—	—	2	2	1	—	—	—	1

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 5-7 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Use of Test Results

Percentages of school systems reporting various uses for test results from various types of tests at selected grades.

How are your test results used? Indicate all the ways in which you use each test.	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Achievement Batteries, K-3						Achievement Batteries, 4-6						Achievement Batteries, 7-8						Achievement Batteries, 9-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Homogeneous ability grouping of students by classes or within classes	29	44	22	62	50	41	32	47	44	68	56	43	18	32	60	54	60	38	10	15	42	48	60	21
Counseling students	34	33	21	33	50	35	37	40	50	42	67	42	76	85	89	92	100	84	87	90	92	98	80	90
Grading students	8	10	6	20	—	10	5	9	12	18	22	9	5	2	13	29	—	8	2	3	10	16	—	5
To evaluate curriculum	37	54	28	60	50	50	33	53	55	64	56	48	38	52	51	54	100	49	45	48	51	61	100	49
To evaluate teaching staff	11	12	4	2	—	10	11	14	6	4	—	11	16	9	4	4	—	9	14	9	7	2	—	10
Diagnosing learning difficulties	83	79	46	67	67	81	84	78	85	70	78	81	69	66	78	83	100	70	61	63	69	57	60	63
Counseling parents	39	43	24	71	83	45	37	44	52	64	67	45	51	50	67	54	100	56	44	56	65	76	80	56
Other	2	3	1	9	50	3	1	2	2	7	33	2	2	1	6	—	—	2	—	1	2	—	—	1
These test results are not used	—	1	—	—	—	*	—	1	—	—	—	*	—	—	2	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	*

	Reading Tests, 7-12						Multi-Aptitude Batteries, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Homogeneous ability grouping of students by classes or within classes	47	45	39	50	—	44	8	19	33	52	33	22
Counseling students	46	66	60	79	—	62	81	93	92	92	100	89
Grading students	—	6	7	19	—	7	1	2	11	20	67	6
To evaluate curriculum	7	18	12	8	—	13	24	12	19	20	—	18
To evaluate teaching staff	4	1	—	—	—	1	2	3	5	—	67	3
Diagnosing learning difficulties	72	95	90	90	—	89	58	62	68	64	—	59
Counseling parents	33	44	48	60	—	46	41	56	72	68	67	57
Other	—	1	3	6	—	2	1	1	2	4	—	2
These test results are not used	—	—	1	—	—	*	1	1	—	—	—	1

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 5-7 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Use of Test Results

Percentages of school systems reporting various uses for test results from various types of tests at selected grades.

How are your test results used? Indicate all the ways in which you use each test.	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																	
	Interest Tests, 9						Interest Tests, 12						Personality Tests, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Homogeneous ability grouping of students by classes or within classes	—	2	1	4	—	2	1	1	3	—	—	1	3	2	3	—	—	2
Counseling students	91	92	88	91	—	90	95	94	98	94	—	95	85	89	90	92	—	89
Grading students	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1
To evaluate curriculum	4	5	1	4	—	4	6	2	4	—	—	3	3	1	—	—	—	1
To evaluate teaching staff	—	1	—	—	—	*	2	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Diagnosing learning difficulties	23	12	11	14	—	13	14	6	8	—	—	9	54	30	27	75	—	36
Counseling parents	54	40	56	59	—	49	36	41	62	66	—	45	52	47	56	33	—	49
Other	—	6	10	9	—	7	1	3	4	—	—	3	3	12	3	—	—	7
These test results are not used	—	1	1	4	—	1	2	1	—	—	—	1	—	1	2	—	—	1

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

Eighty per cent of the school systems report that counseling with students is the most important use they make of the results from multi-aptitude batteries, and schools obviously feel that the most important use for the results of interest and personality tests is to counsel with students.

Amount of Reliance Placed on Test Results

Schools are often accused of placing too much, or too little, reliance on test results in working with their pupils. After being asked to indicate the most important use for test results, schools were asked to report the amount of reliance placed on test results when used for that particular purpose.

Table 5-9 shows that slightly more reliance is placed on reading readiness test results for first grade pupils than for kindergarten pupils. Similarly, schools place more reliance on reading test results at the upper elementary grades than they do in the lower grades. The reliance on reading tests in high school is about the same as that in the upper elementary grades.

The reliance on scholastic aptitude results is the lowest of any type test with the exception of interest and personality tests. Even so, three-fourths of the schools indicate that they put at least a moderate amount of reliance on scholastic aptitude test results. At the elementary level there is a tendency for the smaller school systems to place more reliance on scholastic aptitude test results than do the larger systems.

School personnel tend to put more faith in achievement battery scores than scholastic aptitude test scores; in fact almost 90 per cent of the respondents at every grade level say they place at least a moderate amount of reliance on achievement battery test results.

Faith in interest test scores is considerably lower than for other types of tests. Over one-third of the schools say they place little reliance on interest test results at the ninth grade and over one-fifth of the respondents report the same for the twelfth grade. Reliance becomes stronger as the students progress from freshmen to seniors and almost 20 per cent more respondents indicate moderate reliance on interest test results in grade twelve than was the case for the freshmen.

Although, as shown in Chapter 3, the use of personality inventories in Minnesota schools is not great, those who do use such instruments express a fair amount of reliance on the results. Over three-fourths of the respondents say they place a moderate amount of reliance on personality test results.

TABLE 5-8

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Single Most Important Use for Test Results

Percentages of school systems reporting various uses of test results
from various types of tests at selected grades as "most important."

Indicate the single most important use for the results of this test.	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Reading Readiness, K						Reading Readiness, 1						Reading, K-3						Reading, 4-6					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Homogeneous ability grouping of students by classes or within classes	35	40	42	45	—	40	35	39	40	46	—	38	16	31	39	5	—	27	24	30	36	24	—	29
Counseling students	4	6	9	9	—	7	4	6	7	—	—	5	5	8	7	—	—	6	3	10	13	6	—	8
Grading students	—	1	2	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	1
To evaluate curriculum	4	3	5	—	—	3	2	8	3	—	25	3	9	1	14	14	100	8	11	3	—	—	—	5
To evaluate teaching staff	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—
Diagnosing learning difficulties	46	32	25	36	—	33	50	39	40	38	75	43	63	50	32	67	—	50	55	49	45	71	—	51
Counseling parents	4	11	7	—	—	8	—	3	3	8	—	2	2	1	—	10	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other	—	4	9	—	—	5	—	6	—	—	—	2	1	5	1	—	—	3	3	5	1	—	—	3
These test results are not used	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	8	3	—	9	—	8	7	4	7	8	—	5	4	3	7	5	—	4	5	2	4	—	—	3

	Scholastic Aptitude, K-3						Scholastic Aptitude, 4-6						Scholastic Aptitude, 7-9						Scholastic Aptitude, 10-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Homogeneous ability grouping of students by classes or within classes	28	31	23	18	—	26	16	25	18	12	—	20	4	13	16	3	—	10	13	6	13	—	—	9
Counseling students	14	8	19	5	100	12	19	13	22	10	60	16	64	64	69	77	100	66	64	69	75	88	100	72
Grading students	2	2	2	—	—	2	1	3	3	5	—	2	1	—	1	—	—	*	—	1	—	—	—	1
To evaluate curriculum	1	3	3	—	—	2	3	7	3	—	20	4	1	1	—	—	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	1
To evaluate teaching staff	2	—	—	—	—	*	2	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Diagnosing learning difficulties	40	34	30	46	—	35	33	32	29	43	20	33	24	18	9	10	—	18	17	18	6	12	—	14
Counseling parents	5	7	9	15	—	7	7	7	8	19	—	8	1	2	1	—	—	1	—	—	3	—	—	1
Other	3	6	9	8	—	6	3	6	11	7	—	6	1	1	1	10	—	1	—	1	2	—	—	1
These test results are not used	1	*	1	—	—	1	2	—	2	—	—	1	3	1	1	—	—	2	2	1	—	—	—	1
No Response	9	9	5	8	—	8	13	8	5	5	—	9	2	—	1	—	—	1	2	3	2	—	—	2

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 5-8 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Single Most Important Use for Test Results

Percentages of school systems reporting various uses of test results from various types of tests at selected grades as "most important."

Indicate the single most important use for the results of this test.	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Achievement Batteries, K-3						Achievement Batteries, 4-6						Achievement Batteries, 7-8						Achievement Batteries, 9-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Homogeneous ability grouping of students by classes or within classes	10	17	20	13	33	16	9	16	15	11	—	13	2	15	18	13	40	13	2	5	12	4	40	6
Counseling students	6	8	11	7	—	8	5	11	15	5	11	10	53	56	66	75	40	59	72	75	75	92	20	74
Grading students	3	—	—	—	—	1	2	1	—	—	—	1	2	1	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	*
To evaluate curriculum	9	9	13	24	—	11	9	9	13	25	22	11	14	10	—	—	—	8	8	6	2	—	40	6
To evaluate teaching staff	1	1	1	—	—	1	2	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	1
Diagnosing learning difficulties	64	56	50	22	50	54	66	53	49	30	33	54	23	16	13	8	20	17	15	11	5	2	—	10
Counseling parents	3	6	1	22	—	5	4	5	3	18	—	5	2	—	1	—	—	1	1	1	2	—	—	1
Other	1	1	2	9	17	2	1	1	1	7	33	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	*
These test results are not used	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	*
No Response	2	3	3	2	—	3	2	3	4	5	—	3	3	2	1	4	—	2	2	*	2	2	—	2

	Reading Test, 7-12						Multi-Aptitude Batteries, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Homogeneous ability grouping of students by classes or within classes	37	9	16	13	—	17	1	7	5	—	—	4
Counseling students	14	23	21	27	—	22	76	77	82	92	100	79
Grading students	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
To evaluate curriculum	—	1	1	—	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	1
To evaluate teaching staff	—	1	—	—	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—
Diagnosing learning difficulties	49	65	54	56	—	57	17	10	7	8	—	11
Counseling parents	—	—	1	—	—	*	—	1	2	—	—	1
Other	—	1	3	4	—	2	1	1	1	—	—	1
These test results are not used	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	1
No Response	—	—	3	—	—	1	2	2	3	—	—	2

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 5-8 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Single Most Important Use for Test Results

Percentages of school systems reporting various uses of test results
from various types of tests at selected grades as "most important."

Indicate the single most important use for the results of this test.	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																	
	Interest Tests, 9						Interest Tests, 12						Personality Tests, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Homogeneous ability grouping of students by classes or within classes	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	1	3	—	—	2
Counseling students	91	87	84	91	—	87	94	93	96	94	—	94	79	81	81	75	—	80
Grading students	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
To evaluate curriculum	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
To evaluate teaching staff	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Diagnosing learning difficulties	—	2	—	—	—	1	2	1	—	—	—	1	12	2	7	—	—	5
Counseling parents	5	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	1	3	1	—	25	—	3
Other	—	5	6	5	—	5	—	2	3	—	—	2	3	12	8	—	—	7
These test results are not used	—	1	1	5	—	1	1	1	—	—	—	1	—	1	1	—	—	1
No Response	5	3	9	—	—	5	2	2	—	6	—	2	3	1	4	—	—	2

TABLE 5-9

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Amount of Reliance Placed on Test Results

Percentages of school systems reporting various amounts of reliance on results of various types of tests at selected grade levels.

How much reliance is placed on the test results when used for the most important single purpose?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Reading Readiness, K						Reading Readiness, 1						Reading, K-3						Reading, 4-6					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
A great deal	4	17	22	18	—	17	11	24	30	23	—	21	13	32	14	—	—	20	20	40	23	—	—	29
A moderate amount	81	67	71	55	—	70	72	68	60	62	75	67	77	64	69	95	—	70	70	53	64	76	—	61
Relatively little	—	9	4	18	—	6	4	4	—	8	25	4	4	1	2	—	100	2	3	2	—	18	—	3
Almost none	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
None	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Not applicable	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	1
No Response	15	6	4	9	—	7	13	4	10	8	—	8	7	3	13	5	—	6	7	4	13	6	—	7
	Scholastic Aptitude, K-3						Scholastic Aptitude, 4-6						Scholastic Aptitude, 7-9						Scholastic Aptitude, 10-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
A great deal	2	6	8	3	—	5	1	8	[illegible]	2	—	6	7	5	3	8	—	5	2	4	5	12	—	5
A moderate amount	75	66	71	67	—	70	73	69	[illegible]	67	20	70	80	81	86	85	50	82	91	73	87	76	100	82
Relatively little	8	12	5	13	—	10	7	10	[illegible]	14	20	8	7	10	7	8	50	8	2	13	5	12	—	8
Almost none	2	2	1	5	—	2	1	*	—	2	—	1	1	—	2	—	—	1	—	—	2	—	—	*
None	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	1	—	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	*
Not applicable	3	*	1	—	—	1	1	1	[illegible]	—	—	1	—	1	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	10	14	15	13	100	13	16	12	[illegible]	14	60	15	4	2	1	—	—	2	4	10	2	—	—	5
	Achievement Batteries, K-3						Achievement Batteries, 4-6						Achievement Batteries, 7-8						Achievement Batteries, 9-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
A great deal	11	12	21	7	17	13	12	15	25	10	33	16	15	10	13	17	40	13	12	14	13	20	—	14
A moderate amount	77	76	72	84	83	76	78	74	68	79	33	74	78	87	78	75	60	81	79	79	80	76	40	79
Relatively little	2	8	2	7	—	5	3	6	2	7	33	5	5	2	5	4	—	4	4	4	4	—	40	4
Almost none	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	1
None	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	*
Not applicable	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	*	—	—	1	—	—	*	—	—	2	—	—	*
No Response	8	4	5	2	—	5	5	4	5	5	—	5	2	—	2	4	—	2	4	1	1	4	20	2

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE 5-9 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Amount of Reliance Placed on Test Results

Percentages of school systems reporting various amounts of reliance on results of various types of tests at selected grade levels.

How much reliance is placed on the test results when used for the most important single purpose?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES											
	Reading Test, 7-12						Multi-Aptitude Batteries, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
A great deal	46	18	30	31	—	29	10	10	15	24	—	12
A moderate amount	54	75	64	67	—	66	77	81	82	76	67	80
Relatively little	—	2	1	2	—	1	8	5	1	—	—	4
Almost none	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
None	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	*
Not applicable	—	2	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	*
No Response	—	3	5	—	—	3	4	3	1	—	33	3

	Interest Tests, 9						Interest Tests, 12						Personality Tests, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
A great deal	—	—	—	5	—	1	5	1	2	6	—	2	9	1	2	—	—	3
A moderate amount	73	52	53	64	—	55	66	76	68	80	—	71	76	72	71	100	—	74
Relatively little	14	35	37	9	—	31	18	18	23	11	—	18	9	10	24	—	—	14
Almost none	—	2	2	18	—	4	2	2	4	—	—	2	—	6	2	—	—	3
None	—	1	2	—	—	1	—	1	2	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Not applicable	—	2	—	5	—	1	2	2	2	—	—	2	—	8	—	—	—	4
No Response	14	8	5	—	—	6	7	1	—	3	—	3	6	3	2	—	—	3

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

Chapter 6

High School Testing Programs

Many of the ways in which secondary schools are different from elementary schools result in different practices, emphases, and problems in the conduct of their standardized testing programs. This chapter deals with aspects of standardized testing which are unique to the secondary level.

Participation in the National Defense Education Act (NDEA), Title V-A

Title V-A of the National Defense Education Act has as its primary purpose the improvement of guidance, counseling, and testing programs. Under the Minnesota State Plan in effect in 1965-66, school districts could receive reimbursement under two programs.* The first, called "Guidance and Counseling," encouraged schools to make improvements in their entire guidance, counseling, and testing program.

The second program was specifically aimed at the improvement of testing and was referred to as "Approved Tests Only."

In 1965-66, reimbursement for schools qualifying under the "Guidance and Counseling" program amounted to 6.5 per cent of the total salaries for counselors and clerical personnel. That participation in this phase of NDEA was a function of school size is clearly shown in Table 6-1. All of the urban schools and three-fourths of the suburban schools qualified whereas only 14 per cent of the small school districts participated. One of the most important reasons for the low level of participation in the "Guidance and Counseling" program by the smaller schools was undoubtedly because few of them qualified under the provisions requiring a qualified counselor. Additionally, there may have been some school districts that would have qualified but simply did not apply because the small amount of reimbursement did not seem worth the necessary administrative efforts.

---

*Appendix XIII contains the requirements for reimbursement for the 1965-66 school year.

About one-half of Minnesota school districts were approved for reimbursement for approved tests only, and this does not appear to be related to school size.

TABLE 6-1

SECONDARY — Participation in the National Defense Education Act, Title V-A

Is your school district participating in Title V-A National Defense Education Act for 1965-66?	Percentages of school systems participating in Title V-A, National Defense Education Act during 1965-66.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Reimbursement for guidance and counseling program?						
Yes	14	28	59	76	100	34
No or no response	86	72	41	24	—	66
Reimbursement for approved tests only?						
Yes	46	52	57	40	33	53
No or no response	54	48	43	60	67	47

Subject-Matter Aptitude Tests

Tests having rather limited and specified objectives are an important part of the standardized testing program of many schools. One group of such tests are those which attempt to determine students' aptitude for particular courses of study. Schools were asked whether or not they use aptitude tests for specific subjects and the replies are summarized in Table 6-2, where we find over half of all Minnesota high schools say they do. These tests are more popular in the larger out-state schools and in the urban and suburban districts.

Schools using subject-matter aptitude tests were asked to write in the names of the tests and, in all, twenty-two different aptitude tests were mentioned. Table 6-3 lists all those used in three or more Minnesota schools.

TABLE 6-2

SECONDARY — Subject-Matter Aptitude Tests

Does your school use any aptitude tests for specific subject-matter areas?	Percentages of school systems using aptitude tests for specific subject-matter areas.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Yes	35	60	72	52	33	55
No or no response	65	40	28	48	67	45

TABLE 6-3

SECONDARY — Subject-Matter Aptitude Tests

TEST	Percentages of school systems administering different subject-matter aptitude tests.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
California Algebra Aptitude Test	28	47	28	20	33	36
Orleans Algebra Prognosis Test	2	3	7	8	—	4
Iowa Algebra Aptitude Test	2	6	24	16	—	9
Lee Test of Algebraic Ability	—	1	2	—	—	1
Orleans Geometry Prognosis Test	2	2	4	8	—	3
Iowa Plane Geometry Aptitude Test	—	1	4	—	—	1
Lee Test of Geometric Ability	2	1	—	—	—	1
Turse Shorthand Aptitude Test	2	10	26	4	—	11
ERC Stenographic Aptitude Test	1	2	2	4	—	1
Modern Language Aptitude Test	—	1	2	—	—	1
Seashore Measures of Musical Talents	1	—	1	8	—	1

Whether a freshman should take Algebra or General Math is clearly the decision for which Minnesota high schools are most apt to turn to aptitude tests for assistance—one-half report the use of an Algebra Aptitude Test.

Subject-Matter Achievement Tests

There are hundreds of achievement tests in print which attempt to measure achievement in specific subject areas. Table 6-4 shows that 45 per cent of Minnesota high schools use at least one such test. Although thirty-six different tests were reported only the three shown in Table 6-5 were mentioned by three or more schools.

The Minnesota High School Achievement Examinations, published by American Guidance Service, Inc., are used in one-third of the high schools. These data do not show how many or which of the twenty-seven different achievement tests available in this battery are used in each school, but only say that a school uses at least one of the tests. These examinations are more popular out-state as we find only two suburban and no urban schools reporting their use.

TABLE 6-4

SECONDARY — Subject-Matter Achievement Tests

Does your school use any *standardized, subject-matter achievement* tests?	Percentages of school systems using standardized, subject-matter achievement tests.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Yes	39	49	49	32	33	45
No or no response	61	51	51	68	67	55

External Testing

Senior high schools were asked to indicate the nature and extent of external tests administered to their students. External tests are defined as tests not usually included as part of a school's every-pupil testing program and, in fact, the question was struc-

TABLE 6-5

SECONDARY — Subject-Matter Achievement Tests

TEST	Percentages of school systems administering different subject-matter achievement tests.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Minnesota High School Achievement Examinations.....	34	38	30	8	—	33
Cooperative Achievement Tests...	—	2	7	8	33	3
Nelson Biology Test.............	—	1	3	—	—	1

TABLE 6-6

SECONDARY — External Testing, 1965-66*

TEST	Number of pupils taking each external test.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
ACT..........................	1,382	4,405	7,921	5,610	3,600	22,918
CEEB.........................	152	841	2,270	2,593	1,320	7,176
NMSQT........................	906	3,014	4,281	2,223	840	11,264
PSAT: Gr. 11.................	291	1,191	2,565	1,621	485	6,153
Gr. 12.................	126	431	709	315	—	1,581
MMT..........................	196	767	1,537	802	1,088	4,390
GATB.........................	591	2,315	3,030	269	370	6,575
AQT..........................	1,235	2,698	1,512	151	62	5,658

*Important, see discussion in text before attempting to interpret these figures.

tured in the questionnaire to the extent that "external" tests were listed by name.

Schools were asked to report the proportion of class taking the test and the approximate number of students tested. These latter data are summarized in Table 6-6. It is important to emphasize that the figures in the table do not represent the total number of Minnesota students taking the various tests. First, there were a few schools that did not return questionnaires and a few others that did not answer this particular item. Second, this survey reports information from Minnesota public high schools only and there is a sizeable number of students who take these tests in private high schools.

College Admissions Testing

All Minnesota colleges require that students applying for admission present scores from one of the national college admissions testing programs. As a general rule the public colleges (University of Minnesota, state colleges, junior colleges) require the *American College Testing Program* (ACT), and the private colleges require the *College Entrance Examination Board* (CEEB). Tables 6-7 and 6-8 show the percentages of school systems administering ACT and CEEB to various portions of their senior class. Almost every school had at least a few students taking ACT, one-third had over a third of their students participating, and another one-third had over half of their students included.

Far fewer pupils took CEEB and over half of the smallest high schools had no students taking CEEB.

These tables reflect the greater press for college attendance in the suburban schools where almost half of the schools had the majority of their seniors taking ACT. One suburban high school had 60 to 70 per cent of its seniors taking CEEB!

The *Minnesota Mathematics Test* (MMT) is a test developed at the Institute of Technology of the University of Minnesota and is required of all applicants for that college. In recent years other colleges outside the University of Minnesota have started requiring it for applicants to particular programs such as pre-engineering and mathematics. The test is made available for schools to administer to interested seniors in the local high schools if they wish. Table 6-9 shows that the proportion of seniors taking MMT is also a function of school size.

TABLE 6-7

SECONDARY — External Testing

American College Testing Program (ACT)

Per cent of seniors	Percentages of school systems administering ACT to various numbers of seniors, 1965-66.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
None	5	2	1	—	—	3
1-10	—	1	—	—	—	1
11-20	4	1	2	—	33	3
21-30	11	15	13	8	—	13
31-40	27	23	26	16	33	25
41-50	13	28	31	28	33	24
51-60	24	20	13	32	—	21
61-70	10	6	9	4	—	8
71 and over	5	4	1	12	—	4

Scholarship Testing

The *National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test* (NMSQT) is perhaps the best known scholarship test in wide use in Minnesota high schools and Table 6-10 shows that a large number of Minnesota students take NMSQT each year. Although studies have shown it is almost mandatory that students be in the top ten per cent of their group on most other tests and achievement measures if they are to stand any chance of winning a National Merit Scholarship, the test is taken by a much greater proportion of students in most schools. Only 20 per cent of the schools administer NMSQT to ten per cent or fewer of their pupils.

TABLE 6-8

SECONDARY — External Testing

College Entrance Examination Boards (CEEB)

Per cent of seniors	Percentages of school systems administering CEEB to various numbers of seniors, 1965-66.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
None	54	13	3	—	—	23
1-10	34	65	54	24	67	51
11-12	11	18	33	40	33	20
21-30	1	3	8	20	—	4
31-40	1	1	2	4	—	1
41-50	—	—	—	12	—	1
51-60	—	—	—	—	—	—
61-70	—	—	—	4	—	1
71 and over	—	—	—	—	—	—

Other Testing for After High School

The *Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test* (PSAT) is distributed by the College Entrance Examination Board and the Board considers it a guidance instrument, not an admission or scholarship tool. As its name implies its primary purpose is to give an indication of how a student can expect to score on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) portion of CEEB. It is intended for use primarily by juniors and Table 6-11 shows the extent of that use. While a large number of the smaller schools did not have any students taking PSAT, there are a number of schools which used the test with most or all of their students.

The use of PSAT in the senior year is shown in Table 6-12. The primary reason (and perhaps the only reason) for a Minnesota senior to take PSAT is to attempt to qualify for the National Honor Society Scholarship.

The use of *The General Aptitude Test Battery* (GATB) is controlled by the Minnesota Department of Employment Security. Many Minnesota high schools cooperate with district offices of the Department by arranging for GATB to be administered to some of their seniors. Although there is variation, the usual practice is for the district office to come to the school to administer GATB to seniors selected by the school. These personnel then return to the school to interpret the GATB results to the students. (A plan has recently been developed which should permit high school counselors to administer or interpret GATB in the future.)

Use of this service is a function of school size as can be seen in Table 6-13. The large out-state systems make the most use of these services while only about one-fourth of the smallest-sized schools have seniors taking GATB, and less than half of the suburban schools do.

TABLE 6-9
SECONDARY — External Testing
Minnesota Mathematics Test (MMT)

Per cent of seniors	Percentages of school systems administering MMT to various numbers of seniors, 1965-66.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
None	71	35	11	16	—	39
1-10	16	41	67	60	67	41
11-20	8	15	10	20	33	12
21-30	1	6	9	4	—	5
31-40	2	2	2	—	—	1
41-50	2	1	—	—	—	1
51-60	—	—	—	—	—	—
61-70	—	—	—	—	—	—
71 and over	2	—	1	—	—	1

For the past five years recruiting officers of the United States Air Force have been visiting Minnesota high schools to urge that they administer *The Airman Qualifying Test* (AQT) to the entire senior class, boys *and* girls. The AQT is the screening and placement test used for men enlisting in the USAF, and studies have shown it to serve this purpose reasonably well. When a school permits the USAF to administer AQT to their seniors, the recruiting sergeant administers and scores the examination and returns results to the schools. Interpretive materials are provided but these and the norms are based on the Air Force's experience with new enlistees. There is no research relating AQT scores to post-high school experiences other than in the Air Force. It is interesting that almost one-half of Minnesota schools do cooperate with the Air Force to the extent of administering AQT to at least some of their seniors

TABLE 6-10

SECONDARY — External Testing

National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test (NMSQT)

Per cent of seniors	Percentages of school systems administering NMSQT to various numbers of seniors, 1965-66.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
None	27	8	2	—	33	12
1-10	3	10	13	4	—	8
11-20	16	21	31	52	67	24
21-30	18	26	30	40	—	25
31-40	17	17	12	4	—	15
41-50	11	13	11	—	—	11
51-60	4	2	1	—	—	2
61-70	2	1	—	—	—	1
71 and over	3	2	—	—	—	2

and about one-fifth of Minnesota schools oblige the Air Force to the extent of administering the test to their entire class (Table 6-14). This is more likely to happen in smaller school systems; the recruiters have been least successful in the suburban and urban districts.

Testing Costs Paid by Students

Some schools ask the students to pay the costs for some tests. The results of the question intended to discover the extent of this practice are given in Table 6-15, where we see that seven per cent of Minnesota high schools ask students to pay the costs of at least one test. (Students almost universally pay for "external" tests such as CEEB, ACT, NMSQT, and PSAT.) Schools answering yes to the question were asked to write in the name of the test for which the students pay. Analysis of these write-ins shows that this practice is limited to two tests, the Strong Vocational

TABLE 6-11

SECONDARY — External Testing

Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT), Grade 11

Per cent of juniors	Percentages of school systems administering PSAT to various numbers of juniors, 1965-66.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
None	82	69	37	20	33	63
1-10	1	5	16	16	67	7
11-20	1	5	21	32	—	8
21-30	5	5	15	16	—	8
31-40	4	8	3	8	—	6
41-50	1	3	5	—	—	3
51-60	2	2	—	4	—	2
61-70	—	1	1	—	—	1
71 and over	5	2	—	4	—	3

Interest Blank (SVIB) and the National Educational Development Test (NEDT), the percentages for which are recorded in Table 6-16. Usually schools collecting the cost of the SVIB from students administer it only to those who take it on a voluntary basis. The publishers of NEDT, in their advertising materials, suggest that schools have the students pay for the battery and six Minnesota high schools follow their suggestion. It is worthy of note that the larger urban and suburban systems, where supposedly both the schools and the students have more money, are more likely to ask students to pay for tests.

TABLE 6-12

SECONDARY — External Testing

Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT), Grade 12

Per cent of seniors	Percentages of school systems administering PSAT to various numbers of seniors, 1965-66.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	Sub.	100+	Urban	
None	85	74	52	36	67	70
1-10	6	13	34	52	33	18
11-20	4	7	11	12	—	7
21-30	1	4	3	—	—	2
31-40	2	1	—	—	—	1
41-50	1	1	—	—	—	1
51-60	1	1	—	—	—	1
61-70	—	1	—	—	—	1
71 and over	2	—	—	—	—	1

TABLE 6-13

SECONDARY — External Testing

General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB)

Per cent of seniors	Percentages of school systems administering GATB to various numbers of seniors, 1965-66.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
None	73	52	37	56	67	55
1-10	—	5	15	24	33	7
11-20	7	5	13	20	—	8
21-30	2	8	13	—	—	7
31-40	2	8	3	—	—	5
41-50	3	10	8	—	—	7
51-60	1	4	4	—	—	3
61-70	1	1	1	—	—	1
71 and over	11	9	4	—	—	8

TABLE 6-14

SECONDARY — External Testing

Airman Qualifying Test (AQT)

Per cent of seniors	Percentages of school systems administering AQT to various numbers of seniors, 1965-66.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
None	58	48	57	76	33	54
1-10	—	8	21	20	67	9
11-20	3	9	8	4	—	6
21-30	3	4	4	—	—	3
31-40	—	5	1	—	—	3
41-50	3	7	1	—	—	4
51-60	—	1	—	—	—	1
61-70	1	1	—	—	—	1
71 and over	33	17	8	—	—	20

TABLE 6-15

SECONDARY — Testing Costs Paid by Students

Does your school administer any tests to students for which the students pay the costs? (Other than "external" tests such as ACT, CEEB, PSAT, etc.)	Percentages of school systems reporting the administration of tests to students for which the students pay the costs.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Yes	2	3	15	20	67	7
No or no response	98	97	85	80	33	93

TABLE 6-16

SECONDARY — Tests for Which Students Pay Costs

TEST	Percentage of school systems in which students are required to pay costs.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Strong Vocational Interest Blank	—	1	9	16	67	5
National Educational Development Tests	2	1	2	4	—	2

Chapter 7

Planning for Change

One of the important reasons for this study was to seek ways in which outside agencies can assist schools to make improvements in their school testing programs. Therefore, an attempt was made to find out what changes the schools themselves are planning to make or would like to make. This was done by asking for reactions to a number of specific suggestions.

The first question asked whether the school was planning to make any significant changes in its testing program within the next year. Responses to this inquiry are recorded in Table 7-1. One-fourth of the elementary schools and 28 per cent of the secondary respondents answered in the affirmative. The question is susceptible to variations in what the respondents believe is "significant change." It does seem, however, that with the exception of suburban elementary schools, most schools are not planning significant changes in their testing program.

TABLE 7-1

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Planning for Change

Is your school planning to make any significant changes in its testing program within the next year?	Percentages of school systems planning testing program changes.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
ELEMENTARY						
Yes	28	25	28	42	—	28
No or no response	72	75	72	58	100	72
SECONDARY						
Yes	23	27	24	12	—	24
No or no response	77	73	76	88	100	76

Next, respondents were asked to react to a list of suggestions for change by choosing one of four statements:

1) this change is not needed or planned.
2) this change is needed but not planned.
3) this change is planned but is not needed.
4) this change is both needed and planned.

Many of the suggestions have to do with the possibility of adding or deleting tests from the testing program while others ask for reactions to possibilities for changes in scoring, recording, processing, and interpreting test results. Table 7-2 reports the reactions of the elementary level respondents to the suggestions while Table 7-3 gives the same information for secondary respondents.

First, a word of caution. This item has a rather high portion of "no responses" which are not distributed randomly across school size, but rather are concentrated in the smaller-sized school categories. Although there were fewer no responses in the secondary questionnaires, care must be exercised in studying both these tables and particularly in making comparisons across school size on the elementary level.

Anticipated Changes in Elementary Testing Programs

Reading Readiness Tests. According to the data contained in Table 3-15, over half of Minnesota elementary schools are now using a reading readiness test. Here in Table 7-2 we see that almost one-fourth say they are planning to do more reading readiness testing, and another fifth report they are planning to change to a different reading readiness test. Only one per cent are planning to use fewer reading readiness tests and 16 per cent say they would like to add a reading readiness test but are not planning to do so.

Reading Tests. Plans for standardized reading tests in Minnesota elementary schools are almost identical to those of reading readiness tests. Almost one-fourth of the elementary schools are planning to add standardized reading tests to their testing programs even though almost half already use such tests.

Individual Intelligence Tests. Two-thirds of the elementary schools either are planning to do more individual intelligence

TABLE 7-2

ELEMENTARY — Anticipated Changes in Testing Program

PERCENTAGES OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS REPORTING VARIOUS NEEDS AND PLANS FOR TESTING PROGRAM CHANGES

Some schools are considering one or more of the listed changes for their testing programs. Indicate your reaction to each change suggested for *your* testing program.

SUGGESTION	Size of School System	Is Not Needed or Planned	Is Needed But Not Planned	Is Planned But is Not Needed	Is Both Needed and Planned	No Response
To introduce or use more reading readiness tests	0-35	27	25	2	26	20
	36-99	48	17	—	27	18
	100+	58	4	—	27	10
	Suburban	88	4	—	8	—
	Urban	67	—	—	33	—
	Total	47	16	1	26	11
To use fewer or no reading readiness tests	0-35	59	4	1	2	35
	36-99	73	3	1	1	24
	100+	84	—	—	—	16
	Suburban	92	—	4	4	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	72	2	1	1	24

TABLE 7-2 (Elementary) — Continued

SUGGESTION	Size of School System	Is Not Needed or Planned	Is Needed But Not Planned	Is Planned But is Not Needed	Is Both Needed and Planned	No Response
To introduce or use a different reading readiness test than we are now using	0-35	47	9	1	14	30
	36-99	53	8	—	18	21
	100+	54	4	4	24	13
	Suburban	73	4	—	23	—
	Urban	67	33	—	—	—
	Total	52	8	1	18	20
To introduce or use more standardized reading tests (other than tests which are part of the instructional reading program materials)	0-35	33	23	—	26	19
	36-99	40	22	2	24	12
	100+	51	8	—	26	16
	Suburban	77	8	—	15	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	43	18	1	24	14
To use fewer or no reading tests	0-35	62	2	1	2	34
	36-99	74	1	1	1	24
	100+	81	—	—	1	18
	Suburban	96	—	—	4	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	73	1	1	1	24

TABLE 7-2 (Elementary) — Continued

SUGGESTION	Size of School System	Is Not Needed or Planned	Is Needed But Not Planned	Is Planned But is Not Needed	Is Both Needed and Planned	No Response
To introduce or use a different reading test than we are now using	0-35	39	15	1	13	33
	36-99	48	13	1	18	19
	100+	57	6	2	21	13
	Suburban	77	—	—	23	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	49	11	1	18	20
To introduce or use more individual intelligence tests	0-35	35	30	—	15	20
	36-99	37	30	1	19	14
	100+	35	25	1	27	12
	Suburban	46	8	4	42	—
	Urban	33	33	—	33	—
	Total	36	27	1	22	14
To use fewer or no individual intelligence tests	0-35	61	2	1	2	34
	36-99	73	2	1	1	25
	100+	82	—	—	2	16
	Suburban	100	—	—	—	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	73	1	1	1	24

TABLE 7-2 (Elementary) — Continued

SUGGESTION	Size of School System	Is Not Needed or Planned	Is Needed But Not Planned	Is Planned But is Not Needed	Is Both Needed and Planned	No Response
To introduce or use more group intelligence or scholastic aptitude tests	0-35	50	19	—	7	24
	36-99	63	9	—	9	18
	100+	74	—	2	9	15
	Suburban	96	4	—	—	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	64	10	1	9	18
To use fewer or group intelligence or scholastic aptitude tests	0-35	62	3	1	—	34
	36-99	76	—	—	1	23
	100+	82	1	—	—	17
	Suburban	100	—	—	—	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	75	1	1	1	23
To introduce or use a different group intelligence or scholastic aptitude test than we are now using	0-35	53	8	1	9	29
	36-99	60	6	2	10	22
	100+	69	6	3	8	15
	Suburban	81	8	12	—	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	61	7	3	9	21

TABLE 7-2 (Elementary) — Continued

SUGGESTION	Size of School System	Is Not Needed or Planned	Is Needed But Not Planned	Is Planned But is Not Needed	Is Both Needed and Planned	No Response
To introduce or use more standardized achievement test batteries	0-35	56	8	1	14	21
	36-99	66	9	—	9	16
	100+	74	2	—	4	19
	Suburban	92	8	—	—	—
	Urban	67	—	—	33	—
	Total	66	7	1	9	17
To use fewer or no standardized achievement test batteries	0-35	64	2	—	1	34
	36-99	74	1	1	1	24
	100+	80	—	—	1	19
	Suburban	92	4	—	4	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	74	1	1	1	24
To introduce or use a different standardized achievement test battery than we are now using	0-35	53	11	—	6	30
	36-99	55	18	2	15	20
	100+	58	4	4	17	16
	Suburban	69	12	—	19	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	57	8	2	13	21

TABLE 7-2 (Elementary) — Continued

SUGGESTION	Size of School System	Is Not Needed or Planned	Is Needed But Not Planned	Is Planned But is Not Needed	Is Both Needed and Planned	No Response
To introduce or use more personality or character tests	0-35	35	38	—	3	24
	36-99	48	24	—	9	19
	100+	45	27	—	9	19
	Suburban	65	23	—	12	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	45	28	—	13	19
To use fewer or no personality character tests	0-35	59	3	—	1	37
	36-99	72	2	1	1	25
	100+	73	2	—	3	21
	Suburban	92	4	4	—	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	70	2	1	1	26
To develop more local (school district) norms	0-35	36	24	—	6	33
	36-99	35	26	—	18	21
	100+	26	26	—	33	16
	Suburban	54	12	—	35	—
	Urban	—	67	—	33	—
	Total	35	25	—	19	22

TABLE 7-2 (Elementary) — Continued

SUGGESTION	Size of School System	Is Not Needed or Planned	Is Needed But Not Planned	Is Planned But is Not Needed	Is Both Needed and Planned	No Response
To improve the scoring of tests	0-35	42	22	—	7	29
	36-99	45	19	1	16	20
	100+	45	17	—	20	18
	Suburban	54	12	—	35	—
	Urban	—	33	—	33	33
	Total	44	19	1	16	21
To improve the methods of recording test results	0-35	48	17	1	6	28
	36-99	50	14	—	16	20
	100+	48	19	—	15	18
	Suburban	58	19	—	23	—
	Urban	33	—	—	67	—
	Total	49	16	1	13	21
To improve the processing and reporting or test results to teachers, counselors, and administrators	0-35	39	23	—	10	27
	36-99	38	19	—	22	20
	100+	37	21	—	24	18
	Suburban	50	15	—	35	—
	Urban	—	—	—	100	—
	Total	39	20	—	21	20

TABLE 7-2 (Elementary) — Continued

SUGGESTION	Size of School System	Is Not Needed or Planned	Is Needed But Not Planned	Is Planned But is Not Needed	Is Both Needed and Planned	No Response
To improve the interpretation of test results to pupils and their parents	0-35	27	31	—	18	23
	36-99	29	29	1	26	15
	100+	30	21	—	34	15
	Suburban	35	27	—	38	—
	Urban	—	—	—	100	—
	Total	29	28	1	27	16
To improve the interpretation of test results to teachers, counselors, and administrators	0-35	33	27	—	17	25
	36-99	31	23	—	27	19
	100+	27	21	—	36	16
	Suburban	31	19	—	46	4
	Urban	—	—	—	100	—
	Total	31	23	—	28	19

testing or wish they could. Very few schools are planning to cut back on the amount of individual intelligence testing.

Group Intelligence or Scholastic Aptitude Tests. The part of the table dealing with group scholastic aptitude tests indicates general satisfaction with the amount of this kind of testing now being done. Little change is anticipated or wished for in this area.

Achievement Test Batteries. As with the scholastic aptitude tests, there seems little disposition on the part of Minnesota elementary schools to do either more or less testing with standardized achievement batteries. There is more desire to change to a different battery than was the case with the scholastic aptitude tests, however.

Personality or Character Tests. Elementary schools use very few personality tests but it is interesting that 28 per cent say they would like to use more tests of this nature, and another 13 per cent are definitely planning to do so.

Local Norms. Only one-third of the Minnesota elementary schools have no plans or desires to add to local norms they now have available, if any. One-fifth are planning to develop more local norms during the following year and another one-fourth wish they could.

Improvement in Scoring of Tests. Responses to this suggestion are difficult to interpret because different individuals will naturally have different ideas as to what constitutes "improvement." Many would consider it an improvement if tests were sent to a test scoring agency, relieving the teacher of this burden; while a principal might consider it an improvement if he could get the teachers to score them instead of having to do it himself. Many of the larger systems say they are planning improvements in scoring and one-fifth of all elementary schools say improvements are needed but not planned.

Improvement in Recording of Test Results. Only about one-half the schools are satisfied with their present method of recording results.

Improvement in Reporting of Test Results Within the School System. One-fifth of Minnesota elementary schools are planning to make improvements in the internal processing and reporting of test results to teachers, counselors, and administrators.

Another one-fifth would like to make this change but are not planning to do so.

Improvement of Interpretation of Test Results to Pupils and Parents. Only 29 per cent of the Minnesota elementary schools are satisfied with their current practices of interpreting test results to pupils and parents. Need for improvement is reported by half of the schools.

Improvement of Interpretation of Test Results to the School Staff. The responses to this suggestion are very similar to those for the improvement of test interpretation to parents and pupils. Almost half of the elementary suburban schools are planning to make improvements in this area next year.

Anticipated Changes in Secondary Testing Programs

Reading Tests. Almost one-third of Minnesota high schools say they are planning to introduce or use more reading tests, while another one-third say they would like to make this change but are not planning to do so at this time. Smaller schools are somewhat more anxious to make this change than are the larger systems. Hardly any schools are planning to use fewer reading tests than is now the case. Twice as many secondary respondents say that more use of reading tests is needed but not planned than was the case at the elementary level.

Individual Intelligence Tests. As was the case at the elementary level, about one-fifth of the Minnesota high schools are planning to use more individual intelligence tests in the coming year. Another one-fourth say that this change is needed but not planned. No one seems very anxious to cut back on the amount of individual intelligence testing.

Group Intelligence or Scholastic Aptitude Tests. Reaction to suggestion for changes in group scholastic aptitude testing are again almost identical to the responses at the elementary level, namely, very little change is planned or desired in this phase of the testing program.

Multi-Aptitude Batteries. Here, too, there seems to be little perceived need or planned action, although one-fourth of the smallest-sized school districts would like to add a multi-aptitude battery to their program but are not planning to do so at this time.

Achievement Test Batteries. As at the elementary level, very little change in the amount of achievement testing is anticipated or desired. However, more elementary systems were planning to change to a different achievement battery than is the case in high school.

Interest Tests. Fifteen per cent of all Minnesota high schools are planning to do more interest testing and almost one-fourth of the largest and suburban districts are so planning. Another one-fifth of Minnesota high schools say that more interest testing is needed but not planned. Almost no schools say they are planning to do less interest testing. These plans can be considered with Table 3-21 which shows that half the high schools now use an interest test with their freshmen and almost 70 per cent use one with seniors.

Personality or Character Tests. It will be remembered from Table 3-23 that about one-fifth of Minnesota high schools currently include a personality test in their standardized testing program. The data here would indicate that there will be little change in this percentage in the years just ahead. Notice, however, that 28 per cent of the high schools say they would like to introduce or use more personality tests but are not planning to do so. This is the exact percentage of this response at the elementary level.

Improvement in Scoring of Tests. Seventy per cent of the high schools are not planning or wishing any changes in test scoring procedures. The data in Chapter 4 shows that most standardized tests given in high schools are machine scored. Even so, one-fifth of the suburban schools are planning to make improvements in test scoring procedures and one-fifth of the small school districts would like to make these changes but are not planning to.

Improvement in the Recording of Test Results. This item shows the same trend as the previous one with the larger schools planning to make improvements and the smaller schools feeling the need for improvement but planning none.

Improvement in Reporting of Test Results Within the School System. As was the case at the elementary level quite a few schools are planning to make improvements in the processing and reporting of test results to counselors, teachers, and administrators. The fact that more secondary than elementary schools are feeling the need and planning improvements in this area may be partly because there are greater difficulties with these kinds of communications at the secondary level.

Local Norms. More high schools would like and are planning for local norms than is the case at the elementary level, although a substantial number of schools at both levels are thinking along these lines. Data in Chapter 5 show that secondary schools already have more local norms available than do elementary schools.

Improvement in the Interpretation of Test Results to Pupils and Parents. Only one-fourth of Minnesota high schools are satisfied with their present methods of interpreting test results to pupils and parents, and 41 per cent are planning to make improvements in this area.

Improvement in the Interpretation of Test Results to School Staff. Forty-four per cent of all Minnesota high schools are planning improvements here and another one-third feels the need to do so. This compares with about half as many elementary schools who say they are planning these improvements.

TABLE 7-3

SECONDARY — Anticipated Changes in Testing Program

PERCENTAGES OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS REPORTING VARIOUS NEEDS AND PLANS FOR TESTING PROGRAM CHANGES

Some schools are considering one or more of the listed changes for their testing programs. Indicate your reaction to each change suggested for *your* testing program.

SUGGESTION	Size of School System	Is Not Needed or Planned	Is Needed But Not Planned	Is Planned But is Not Needed	Is Both Needed and Planned	No Response
To introduce or use more reading tests (other than tests which are part of the instructional reading program materials)	0-35	26	39	—	31	4
	36-99	27	37	—	33	2
	100+	47	21	—	29	3
	Suburban	56	24	—	20	—
	Urban	67	—	—	33	—
	Total	33	34	—	31	3
To use fewer or no reading tests	0-35	78	4	—	2	16
	36-99	85	3	—	2	11
	100+	88	2	—	—	10
	Suburban	100	—	—	—	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	62	3	—	1	11

TABLE 7-3 (Secondary) — Continued

SUGGESTION	Size of School System	Is Not Needed or Planned	Is Needed But Not Planned	Is Planned But is Not Needed	Is Both Needed and Planned	No Response
To introduce or use more individual intelligence tests	0-35	46	32	2	9	10
	36-99	48	27	—	22	3
	100+	48	16	—	31	4
	Suburban	52	24	4	20	—
	Urban	33	33	—	33	—
	Total	47	26	1	20	5
To use fewer or no individual intelligence tests	0-35	80	—	1	1	19
	36-99	85	4	—	1	9
	100+	89	1	—	—	10
	Suburban	96	4	—	—	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	85	2	1	1	11
To introduce or use more group intelligence or scholastic aptitude tests	0-35	67	15	2	9	8
	36-99	74	7	—	14	5
	100+	84	4	—	5	7
	Suburban	92	4	—	4	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	75	8	1	10	6

TABLE 7-3 (Secondary) — Continued

SUGGESTION	Size of School System	Is Not Needed or Planned	Is Needed But Not Planned	Is Planned But is Not Needed	Is Both Needed and Planned	No Response
To use fewer or no group intelligence or scholastic aptitude tests	0-35	77	1	1	4	18
	36-99	90	1	—	1	9
	100+	87	3	—	1	9
	Suburban	100	—	—	—	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	86	1	1	2	11
To introduce or use a different group intelligence or scholastic aptitude test than we are now using	0-35	73	8	2	4	14
	36-99	78	5	1	8	8
	100+	86	1	—	8	5
	Suburban	92	4	—	4	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	79	5	1	6	9
To introduce or use more multi-aptitude batteries	0-35	59	26	1	3	11
	36-99	69	17	1	8	5
	100+	81	8	—	5	5
	Suburban	88	12	—	—	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	70	17	1	6	7

TABLE 7-3 (Secondary) — Continued

SUGGESTION	Size of School System	Is Not Needed or Planned	Is Needed But Not Planned	Is Planned But is Not Needed	Is Both Needed and Planned	No Response
To use fewer or no multi-aptitude batteries	0-35	80	1	—	1	18
	36-99	89	1	—	1	9
	100+	90	1	—	—	9
	Suburban	92	8	—	—	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	80	7	1	2	10
To introduce or use a different multi-aptitude battery than we are now using	0-35	68	14	2	2	15
	36-99	82	4	1	3	9
	100+	88	5	—	—	7
	Suburban	96	4	—	—	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	80	7	1	2	10
To introduce or use more standardized achievement test batteries	0-35	66	17	2	6	9
	36-99	68	11	—	16	5
	100+	75	4	1	14	5
	Suburban	84	8	—	8	—
	Urban	67	—	—	33	—
	Total	70	11	1	12	6

TABLE 7-3 (Secondary) — Continued

SUGGESTION	Size of School System	Is Not Needed or Planned	Is Needed But Not Planned	Is Planned But is Not Needed	Is Both Needed and Planned	No Response
To use fewer or no standardized achievement test batteries	0-35	81	1	—	—	18
	36-99	88	1	—	1	10
	100+	85	3	—	1	11
	Suburban	96	4	—	—	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	86	1	—	1	12
To introduce or use a different standardized achievement battery than we are now using	0-35	74	7	1	2	16
	36-99	79	6	—	5	10
	100+	80	3	—	8	9
	Suburban	88	8	—	4	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	79	6	1	5	11
To introduce or use more interest tests	0-35	45	29	2	13	11
	36-99	61	20	2	12	5
	100+	57	15	—	23	4
	Suburban	64	12	—	24	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	56	21	1	15	6

TABLE 7-3 (Secondary) — Continued

SUGGESTION	Size of School System	Is Not Needed or Planned	Is Needed But Not Planned	Is Planned But is Not Needed	Is Both Needed and Planned	No Response
To use fewer or no interest tests	0-35	79	1	2	—	19
	36-99	85	2	—	2	11
	100+	86	3	—	1	10
	Suburban	96	—	—	—	4
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	84	2	1	1	12
To introduce or use more personality or character tests	0-35	52	30	—	8	10
	36-99	58	29	1	7	5
	100+	63	22	—	9	7
	Suburban	64	36	—	—	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	58	28	1	7	7
To use fewer or no personality or character tests	0-35	80	2	—	—	19
	36-99	85	2	1	3	10
	100+	84	3	1	2	10
	Suburban	100	—	—	—	—
	Urban	100	—	—	—	—
	Total	84	2	1	2	12

TABLE 7-3 (Secondary) — Continued

SUGGESTION	Size of School System	Is Not Needed or Planned	Is Needed But Not Planned	Is Planned But is Not Needed	Is Both Needed and Planned	No Response
To develop more local (school district) norms	0-35	36	36	2	14	13
	36-99	25	40	1	31	3
	100+	27	26	1	42	3
	Suburban	60	16	—	24	—
	Urban	—	67	—	33	—
	Total	31	35	1	28	6
To improve the scoring of tests	0-35	62	19	—	7	13
	36-99	77	5	1	11	6
	100+	65	9	—	19	8
	Suburban	76	4	—	20	—
	Urban	33	33	—	33	—
	Total	70	10	1	12	8
To improve the methods of recording test results	0-35	59	22	1	6	12
	36-99	67	11	—	18	4
	100+	57	20	—	15	8
	Suburban	60	16	—	24	—
	Urban	33	33	—	33	—
	Total	62	16	1	8	7

TABLE 7-3 (Secondary) — Continued

SUGGESTION	Size of School System	Is Not Needed or Planned	Is Needed But Not Planned	Is Planned But is Not Needed	Is Both Needed and Planned	No Response
To improve the processing and reporting of test results to teachers, counselors, or administrators	0-35	24	33	—	32	11
	36-99	27	28	1	39	4
	100+	33	24	—	38	4
	Suburban	32	20	—	48	—
	Urban	33	—	—	67	—
	Total	31	35	1	28	6
To improve the interpretation of test results to pupils and their parents	0-35	23	38	2	31	6
	36-99	24	27	1	44	4
	100+	32	15	—	47	5
	Suburban	28	32	—	40	—
	Urban	—	—	—	100	—
	Total	25	28	1	41	5
To improve the interpretation of test results to teachers, counselors, and administrators	0-35	21	30	—	41	7
	36-99	21	29	—	47	3
	100+	24	27	—	43	5
	Suburban	20	44	4	32	—
	Urban	—	—	—	100	—
	Total	22	30	1	44	5

Chapter 8

Possibilities for Improvement

The data reported in this chapter were gathered as a further attempt to discover ways in which outside agencies can assist schools to improve their use of standardized test results. The previous chapter reported the reactions of questionnaire respondents to a list of possible changes and improvements in their own testing programs. This chapter tabulates their opinions of a list of suggested services or activities which outside agencies might develop to help school systems improve their testing programs. It would be better if the lists of possibilities were more inclusive but hopefully they will give some idea of the flavor of the thinking of school personnel.

Respondents were asked to give one of three reactions to each suggestion:

1) this would be extremely beneficial.
2) this would be nice, but we can live without it.
3) this idea holds little or no attraction for me.

Tables 8-1 and 8-2 summarize reactions to the various suggestions.

Reactions to Suggestions for Improved Aids and Services at the Elementary Level

Local Norms. Over one-half of the elementary school respondents say that local norms for their standardized tests would be extremely beneficial. Responses to this suggestion are influenced by size of school system since we find that only one-third of the smallest of schools are interested in having local norms while over 80 per cent of the suburban districts would like them. About one-fifth of the respondents are not interested in local norms.

Minnesota Norms. Many more elementary schools are interested in having Minnesota norms for their standardized tests

TABLE 8-1

ELEMENTARY — Reactions to Suggestions for Improvements in Use of Test Results

PERCENTAGES OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS WITH EACH REACTION TO SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT IN USE OF TEST RESULTS

Listed below are some aids or activities which have been suggested as things which might help school personnel get increased and more effective use of standardized test results. Mark the statement which best indicates your reaction to each of the suggestions.

SUGGESTIONS	REACTIONS	Size of School System					Total
		1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Local (school district) Norms for your standardized tests.	This would be extremely beneficial	36	52	63	81	67	52
	This would be nice, but we can live without it	23	23	21	15	33	22
	This idea holds little or no attraction for me	28	18	9	4	—	18
	No response	13	7	7	—	—	8
Minnesota Norms for your standardized tests.	This would be extremely beneficial	70	74	71	50	33	71
	This would be nice, but we can live without it	18	17	24	35	67	20
	This idea holds little or no attraction for me	2	2	3	15	—	3
	No response	11	6	2	—	—	7

TABLE 8-1 (Elementary) — Continued

SUGGESTIONS	REACTIONS	Size of School System					Total
		1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Regional Norms for your standardized tests.	This would be extremely beneficial	46	48	47	35	—	46
	This would be nice, but we can live without it	26	30	35	42	100	31
	This idea holds little or no attraction for me	15	13	13	23	—	14
	No response	13	10	4	—	—	9
Consultants to work with your staff on the use of test results, test selection, interpretation, etc. (At least one visit per year).	This would be extremely beneficial	66	64	64	85	—	64
	This would be nice, but we can live without it	20	23	20	35	67	22
	This idea holds little or no attraction for me	7	9	12	8	—	9
	No response	7	5	3	—	33	5
Regional workshops on the interpretation and use of test results conducted by the State Department of Education or a college or university.	This would be extremely beneficial	68	67	65	58	33	66
	This would be nice, but we can live without it	13	21	18	27	67	19
	This idea holds little or no attraction for me	12	9	15	15	—	11
	No response	7	3	2	—	—	4

TABLE 8-1 (Elementary) — Continued

SUGGESTIONS	REACTIONS	Size of School System					Total
		1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Substantially more emphasis on the use of standardized test results in the college preparation of elementary school teachers.	This would be extremely beneficial.....	54	62	63	65	100	61
	This would be nice, but we can live without it........................	19	16	16	15	—	17
	This idea holds little or no attraction for me..........................	14	15	18	19	—	15
	No response......................	14	6	3	—	—	7
A periodical publication containing items specifically for Minnesota Elementary School test-users such as new tests and developments, test reviews, reports of successful practices in other schools, research results of general interest, etc.	This would be extremely beneficial.....	76	78	78	81	100	77
	This would be nice, but we can live without it........................	17	12	12	19	—	14
	This idea holds little or no attraction for me..........................	2	5	8	—	—	4
	No response......................	6	5	2	—	—	4
An elementary school counselor (as different from a school psychologist or social worker).	This would be extremely beneficial.....	53	47	51	54	67	50
	This would be nice, but we can live without it........................	23	33	21	23	33	27
	This idea holds little or no attraction for me..........................	15	11	20	23	—	15
	No response......................	10	9	7	—	—	8

than are interested in local norms—over 70 per cent react in the most positive way to this possibility while only three per cent indicate little interest. This suggestion produced some interesting variations according to size of school district in that three-fourths of the out-state schools, regardless of size, are anxious to have Minnesota norms but only half of the suburban schools feel they would be "extremely beneficial."

Regional Norms. "Regional norms" were not defined so reactions to this suggestion may include some variations because respondents had different perceptions of what this means. Although there is much positive reaction to this suggestion it is not as great as to the suggestions for local and Minnesota norms.

Test Consultants. Over two-thirds of the respondents feel that consultants on testing to work directly with elementary school staffs on the use of test results would be extremely beneficial and only seven per cent express little interest.

Regional Workshops. About two-thirds of the respondents give the most positive reaction to the suggestion for regional workshops on the interpretation and use of test results. Over 10 per cent say that this idea holds no attraction for them.

More Emphasis on Standardized Tests in Teacher Preparation. Sixty per cent say that this would be a good idea, but this particular suggestion also has one of the higher negative responses, 15 per cent.

A Periodical on Testing. Almost four-fifths of the respondents say a periodical containing items specifically for Minnesota elementary school test users would be extremely beneficial.

Elementary School Counselor. Appendix III shows there are very few persons holding assignments as elementary school counselors in Minnesota. Reactions to this suggestion show that about half the schools feel it would be extremely beneficial to have such a person on their staff. This suggestion also has one of the higher percentages of negative responses.

Reactions to Suggestions for Improved Aids and Services at the Secondary Level

Local Norms. The percentage of secondary respondents giving the most positive response to this suggestion is identical to the

TABLE 8-2

SECONDARY — Reactions to Suggestions for Improvements in Use of Test Results

PERCENTAGES OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS WITH EACH REACTION TO SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT IN USE OF TEST RESULTS

Listed below are some aids or activities which have been suggested as things which might help school personnel get increased and more effective use of standardized test results. Mark the statement which best indicates your reaction to each of the suggestions.

SUGGESTIONS	REACTIONS	Size of School System					Total
		1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Local (school district) Norms for your standardized tests (where none now exist).	This would be extremely beneficial	40	53	62	76	33	52
	This would be nice, but we can live without it	35	34	22	8	67	31
	This idea holds little or no attraction for me	18	10	3	4	—	10
	No response	7	4	13	12	—	7
Minnesota Norms for your standardized tests (where none now exist).	This would be extremely beneficial	73	73	69	68	33	72
	This would be nice, but we can live without it	20	19	20	28	67	20
	This idea holds little or no attraction for me	2	3	1	—	—	2
	No response	5	5	10	4	—	6

TABLE 8-2 (Secondary) — Continued

SUGGESTIONS	REACTIONS	Size of School System					Total
		1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Regional Norms for your standardized tests.	This would be extremely beneficial	36	28	27	24	33	30
	This would be nice, but we can live without it	40	48	44	60	67	46
	This idea holds little or no attraction for me	17	21	23	16	—	20
	No response	7	3	5	—	—	4
More consultants to work with your staff on the use of test results, test selection, interpretation, etc.	This would be extremely beneficial	71	69	52	64	33	65
	This would be nice, but we can live without it	18	21	36	36	67	25
	This idea holds little or no attraction for me	5	9	9	—	—	7
	No response	5	2	3	—	—	3
Regional workshops on the interpretation and use of test results conducted by the State Department of Education or a college or university on a regular basis.	This would be extremely beneficial	69	73	54	60	33	67
	This would be nice, but we can live without it	21	18	32	20	67	22
	This idea holds little or no attraction for me	7	8	12	20	—	9
	No response	4	2	2	—	—	3

TABLE 8-2 (Secondary) — Continued

SUGGESTIONS	REACTIONS	Size of School System					Total
		1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Substantially more emphasis on the use of standardized test results in the college preparation of secondary school teachers.	This would be extremely beneficial	54	67	66	72	100	63
	This would be nice, but we can live without it	25	19	16	20	—	20
	This idea holds little or no attraction for me	15	13	13	8	—	13
	No response	6	2	4	—	—	4
A periodical publication containing items specifically for Minnesota high school test-users such as new tests and developments, test reviews, reports of successful practices in other schools, research results of general interest, etc.	This would be extremely beneficial	55	78	82	92	100	73
	This would be nice, but we can live without it	37	16	12	8	—	20
	This idea holds little or no attraction for me	3	5	3	—	—	4
	No response	5	2	2	—	—	3
Substantially more interpretative materials and data for specific tests than is now available in Manuals or from other sources.	This would be extremely beneficial	48	48	53	64	67	50
	This would be nice, but we can live without it	34	41	35	28	33	37
	This idea holds little or no attraction for me	11	10	7	4	—	9
	No response	7	2	5	4	—	4

percentage found at the elementary level, although there are more negative responses at elementary. Also, the high school reactions do not show as wide a variation in response due to school size as elementary. More of the suburban high schools and fewer of the smaller high schools want local norms.

Minnesota Norms. Again there was an almost identical response of 70 per cent on this suggestion at both the elementary and secondary levels. Notice that the idea of Minnesota norms seems more desirable to the suburban high schools than it does to the suburban elementary schools.

Regional Norms. The feeling for regional norms among the high school respondents is, at best, lukewarm and is certainly less than that expressed by their colleagues at the elementary level.

Consultants. About two-thirds of the respondents would like more consultants to work with their staffs. Although the percentages giving the most positive response to this suggestion are almost identical at the two levels, more of the high school personnel in the smaller schools want consultants and more of the elementary personnel in the larger and suburban schools want more consultants.

Regional Workshops. Two-thirds of the respondents feel regional workshops would be extremely beneficial, with almost identical reactions at the elementary and secondary levels.

More Emphasis on Standardized Tests in Teacher Preparation. Like their colleagues at the elementary level, the secondary respondents would like teachers to receive more instruction on the use and interpretation of standardized tests while in college.

A Periodical Publication. Although secondary schools receive considerably more information on standardized tests and their interpretation than do elementary, they seem no less anxious to receive even more published materials about tests and their uses.

More Interpretive Materials. Although half of the high schools would appreciate substantially more interpretive material for standardized tests than is now available, the responses to this suggestion are not as enthusiastic as for some of the others.

Forced Choice among Suggestions

After the respondents had rated each of the suggestions, they were asked to choose the one suggestion which, "you would prefer to all the others," and the one which, "appeals least to you." The results of these forced choices, tabulated in Tables 8-3 and 8-4, not show any clear preference.

The preference for local norms is equal at the elementary and secondary levels and it is clearly a function of the school district size. The smaller systems are much less anxious for local norms than the larger systems.

Slightly over 10 per cent of the elementary schools choose Minnesota norms as the most preferred suggestion, and half as many high schools make that choice. This and the data on this suggestion in Table 8-2 may be partially influenced by the fact that Minnesota norms already exist for a number of standardized tests commonly used in Minnesota high schools, while there are no Minnesota norms for any elementary level tests. Regional norms are pretty clearly the least attractive of the list of eight suggestions at both levels.

Thirteen per cent of the elementary schools and 25 per cent of the secondary schools believe regional workshops on the interpretation and use of test results to be the most helpful of the suggestions. Ten per cent of the elementary respondents choose this alternative as the least desirable. Responses are a function of school location with the out-state schools more desirous of workshops than those near the Twin Cities.

The possibility of having more consultants to work with the staff on the problems of tests was the most appealing suggestion to about one-fifth of the respondents. Here too the smaller schools are more apt to ask for this form of assistance than the larger systems.

The idea of having substantially more emphasis on the use of standardized test results in the college preparation of teachers is markedly related to size of school system at both the secondary and elementary levels. More of the respondents from suburban secondary schools choose this alternative than any of the other suggestions, and this choice was selected as most important by all three of the urban respondents.

TABLE 8-3

ELEMENTARY — Most and Least Preferred Suggestions

PERCENTAGES OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS PREFERRING EACH SUGGESTION TO ALL OTHERS AND PERCENTAGES INDICATING LEAST PREFERENCE

Among the eight suggestions, which would you prefer to all others and which appeals least to you?

SUGGESTION	MOST						LEAST					
	Size of School System					Total	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban		1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Local (school district) Norms for your standardized tests	6	4	13	23	33	9	25	16	8	—	—	16
Minnesota Norms for your standardized tests	15	10	10	8	—	11	—	1	4	19	—	2
Regional Norms for your standardized tests	2	3	2	4	—	2	18	13	17	27	33	16
Regional workshops on the interpretation and use of test results conducted by the State Department of Education or a college or university	17	18	3	—	—	13	6	9	13	12	33	10
Consultants to work with your staff on the use of test results, test selection, interpretation, etc. (At least one visit per year)	24	16	17	12	—	18	5	8	10	4	—	7
Substantially more emphasis on the use of standardized test results in the college preparation of elementary school teachers	—	5	6	12	67	4	11	16	15	12	—	14
A periodical publication containing items specifically for Minnesota Elementary School test-users such as new tests and developments, test reviews, reports of successful practices in other schools, research results of general interest, etc.	14	19	19	15	—	17	7	6	7	4	—	6
An elementary school counselor (as different from a school psychologist or social worker)	15	19	25	27	—	19	13	18	18	19	—	16
No response	9	6	4	—	—	6	15	13	8	4	33	12

A periodical publication for Minnesota test users was the most attractive choice for 17 per cent of the respondents at both the elementary and secondary level. Interestingly, the smaller systems are slightly less apt to choose this suggestion than the larger systems.

Data in the two tables are not directly comparable between elementary and secondary levels because each contains a unique suggestion. The possibility of having an elementary school counselor is posed on the list of elementary school suggestions and almost one-fifth of Minnesota elementary schools choose this as the most desirable suggestion. There is a slight tendency for the larger systems to choose this alternative more often although two other suggestions tie with it. This suggestion is also the most often chosen as the least desirable.

The suggestion unique to the secondary list, "Substantially more interpretive materials . . . ," had very few respondents, four per cent, preferring it to the other suggestions on the list.

TABLE 8-4

SECONDARY — Most and Least Preferred Suggestions

PERCENTAGES OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS PREFERRING EACH SUGGESTION TO ALL OTHERS AND PERCENTAGES INDICATING LEAST PREFERENCE

Among the eight suggestions, which would you prefer to all others and which appeals least to you?

SUGGESTION	MOST						LEAST					
	Size of School System					Total	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban		1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Local (school district) Norms for your standardized tests (where none now exist)	6	8	15	12	—	9	20	14	—	4	—	12
Minnesota Norms for your standardized tests (where none now exist)	2	7	5	—	—	5	2	1	1	—	—	1
Regional Norms for your standardized tests	2	—	3	4	—	2	18	37	29	44	33	30
More consultants to work with your staff on the use of test results, test selection, interpretation, etc. (At least one visit each year)	31	19	15	16	—	22	3	4	8	—	33	5
Regional workshops on the interpretation and use of test results conducted by the State Department of Education or a college or university on a regular basis	23	33	15	16	—	25	6	3	18	24	33	8
Substantially more emphasis on the use of standardized test results in the college preparation of secondary school teachers	7	10	15	24	100	11	16	12	15	4	—	14
A periodical publication containing items specifically for Minnesota High School test-users such as new tests and developments, test reviews, reports of successful practices in other schools, research results of general interest, etc.	12	18	20	20	—	17	8	3	7	4	—	5
Substantially more interpretative materials and data for specific tests than is now available in Manuals or from other sources	7	2	2	8	—	4	16	19	16	16	—	18
No response	9	3	8	—	—	6	10	6	7	4	—	7

Chapter 9

Summary

Elementary-Secondary Comparisons

The contrast between elementary and secondary levels in the nature of testing programs, amount of testing, and use of test results is striking. As compared with her colleague at the high school level, the elementary school teacher administers more tests, scores more tests, and records more test results. She is more apt to have test scores in her possession. Only rarely will she be able to get assistance from a staff member in her building who is qualified by training and background to assist in the interpretation and use of test results while in high schools there are often counselors with specific training in the administration and interpretation of standardized tests. There are no visiting consultants or other "experts" with specific training and expertise in testing coming to visit elementary schools as is the case at the high school level. The existence of the Minnesota State-Wide Testing Programs causes interpretive material to be available for high schools which is nonexistent for elementary schools. For example, Minnesota norms have been developed for many tests used in Minnesota high schools but there are no Minnesota norms for any elementary level tests. Many more high schools have developed local norms for their tests than have elementary schools.

Despite the fact that elementary teachers have much less help with the interpretation of test results and have fewer interpretive materials available, they are much more apt to be assigned to interpret test results to parents and students. The great bulk of the test interpretation in Minnesota elementary schools is done by teachers while high school teachers do very little. So we have elementary teachers with considerably greater responsibilities for interpreting standardized test results to parents and pupils and yet these teachers have less background, less experience, and less assistance in the execution of this duty.

Standardized Testing Programs in Smaller Systems as Compared with Larger Systems

The findings contrasting the amount of testing in the smaller and larger school systems are particularly interesting. One common stereotype is that of the small school with no counselor and with a principal with no formal training in testing trying to operate a guidance program along with many other important and pressing duties. This stereotype has the principal or superintendent ordering many different tests according to which publisher has the most attractive catalog or persuasive salesman. On the other hand, the larger, sophisticated, school systems are pictured as having testing committees carefully screening and selecting only a minimal number of tests. Additionally, it seems that complaints about "too much testing" are most apt to come from larger school systems. Yet, the data in this survey show this stereotype to be in error. In fact, the amount of testing is proportional to the size of the school system, with the possible exception of the large urban systems. The most tested students in Minnesota are those in suburban systems!

Effect of Size on Quality of Program

The effect of system size on the quality of the testing program shows up in this survey as in so many other studies of Minnesota education. The smaller schools have fewer counselors, less consultative help, and are more limited in the assistance they can give pupils.

The smaller systems have much less flexibility and freedom of operation than the larger systems. In Chapter 7, "Planning for Change," the smaller systems selected the response, "this change is needed but not planned," much more frequently than the larger systems.

Appendix I

School Systems Returning Questionnaire by Size of School System

Group I. (Class Size 0-36)

Akeley
Alberta
Alvarado
Amboy
Argyle**
Ashby
Askov
Audubon

Backus
Badger
Balaton
Barrett
Beardsley
Becker
Bellingham
Belview
Big Lake
Borup
Boyd
Brewster
Bricelyn
Brownton
Butterfield

Campbell
Canton
Ceylon
Chokio
Claremont
Cleveland
Clinton
Cosmos
Cromwell
Cyrus

Deer Creek
Delavan

Eagle Bend
Echo
Edgerton
Elkton
Ellsworth
Elmore
Emmons
Erskine
Evansville

Felton
Finlayson
Fisher
Floodwood
Franklin
Freeborn
Frost

Garden City
Gary
Glenville
Glyndon
Gonvick
Good Thunder**
Granada
Grand Meadow
Grey Eagle
Grove City

Halstad
Hancock
Hanska
Henderson
Hendrum
Hill City
Hills-Beaver Creek
Hitterdal
Hoffman
Huntley

Jeffers

Karlstad
Kelliher
Kennedy
Kensington
Kiester

Lake Benton
Lake Bronson
Lake Wilson
Lancaster
La Porte

---

*Elementary Questionnaire only.
**Secondary Questionnaire only.

Lester Prairie
Lyle
Lynd

McGrath
Magnolia
Marietta
Mentor
Milroy
Minnesota Lake
Morristown
Morton
Murdock

Nevis

Odessa
Ogilvie
Okabena
Oslo

Peterson
Pillager
Plummer

Randolph
Rapidan
Remer
Rockford
Rose Creek
Round Lake
Russell
Ruthton

Sacred Heart
Sanborn
Sioux Valley
South Koochiching County and Rainy River

Stephen
Storden
Strandquist

Taylor Falls
Tintah
Trimont

Ulen

Verdi
Verndale
Villard

Welcome
Williams
Wood Lake
Wykoff**

Group II. (Class Size 36-99)

Ada
Adams
Adrian
Albany
Alden
Annandale
Appleton
Arlington
Atwater

Babbitt
Bagley
Barnesville
Barnum
Battle Lake
Baudette
Belgrade
Belle Plaine
Bertha-Hewitt
Bird Island
Biwabik

Blackduck
Blooming Prairie
Braham
Brandon
Brooten
Browerville
Buffalo Lake
Buhl
Byron

Caledonia
Cannon Falls
Carlton
Cass Lake
Chaska
Chisago City
Clara City
Clarissa
Clarkfield
Clearbrook
Climax

Cokato
Comfrey
Cottonwood

Danube
Dassel**
Dawson
Delano
Dilworth
Dodge
Dover-Eyota

Eden Valley
Elbow Lake
Elgin
Ellendale

Fairfax**
Farmington
Fertile
Fosston
Frazee

**Secondary Questionnaire only.

Fulda

Gaylord
Gibbon
Gilbert
Goodhue
Goodridge
Graceville
Grand Marais
Granite Falls
Greenbush

Hallock
Harmony
Hawley
Hector
Henning
Herman
Hermantown
Heron Lake
Hinckley
Holdingford
Houston
Howard Lake

Inver Grove-Pine Bend
Isle
Ivanhoe

Janesville
Jasper
Jordan

Kasson-Mantorville
Kenyon
Kerkhoven
Kimball

Lake Crystal
Lakefield
Lake Park*
Lamberton
Lanesboro
Le Center
Le Roy
Le Sueur
Lewiston
Lindstrom-Center City
Little Fork-Big Falls
Long Prairie

McGregor
McIntosh
Mabel
Madelia
Madison**
Mahnomen
Maple Lake
Mapleton
Mazeppa
Medford
Menahga
Middle River
Milan
Minneota
Montgomery
Monticello
Moose Lake
Mora
Morgan
Motley
Mountain Iron
Mountain Lake

Nashwauk-Keewatin
New Folden
New London
New Richland
New York Mills
Nicollet
North Branch
Norwood-Young America

Oklee
Olivia
Onamia
Ortonville*
Osakis

Parkers Prairie
Pelican Rapids
Pequot Lakes
Pine Island
Pine River
Plainview
Preston
Prior Lake
Proctor

Raymond
Red Lake
Red Lake Falls
Renville
Royalton
Rush City
Rushford

St. Charles
St. Clair
Sandstone
Sebeka
Sherburn
Silver Lake
Sleepy Eye
Spring Grove
Spring Valley
Starbuck*
Stewart
Stewartville

Thomson Township
Tower-Soudan
Tracy
Truman
Twin Valley
Tyler

---

*Elementary Questionnaire only.
**Secondary Questionanire only.

Underwood
Upsala

Wabasha
Wabasso
Waldorf-Pemberton
Walker
Wanamingo
Warren
Warroad
Watertown
Westbrook
West Concord
Wheaton
Willow River
Winnebago
Winthrop
Wrenshall

Zumbrota

Group III. (Class Size 100 or more)

Aitkin
Albert Lea
Alexandria
Aurora-Hoyt Lakes
Austin

Bemidji
Benson
Blue Earth
Brainerd
Breckenridge
Brooklyn Center
Buffalo
Burnsville

Cambridge
Canby
Chatfield
Chisholm
Circle Pines
Cloquet
Coleraine
Crookston
Crosby-Ironton

Deer River
Detroit Lakes

East Grand Forks
Elk River**
Ely
Eveleth

Fairmont
Faribault
Fergus Falls
Foley

Glencoe
Glenwood
Grand Rapids

Hastings
Hayfield
Hibbing
Hutchinson

International Falls

Jackson

La Crescent
Lake City**
Lake County
Lakeville
Litchfield
Little Falls
Luverne

Mahtomedi
Mankato
Marshall
Melrose
Milaca
Montevideo
Moorhead
Morris

New Prague
New Ulm
Northfield

Orono
Owatonna

Park Rapids
Paynesville
Perham
Pine City
Pipestone
Princeton

Red Wing
Redwood Falls
Rochester
Roseau

St. Cloud
St. Francis
St. James
St. Louis County
St. Peter
Sauk Centre
Sauk Rapids
Shakopee
Slayton
Staples
Stillwater

Thief River Falls

Virginia

Waconia

**Secondary Questionnaire only.

Wadena
Waseca
Wells
Willmar
Windom
Winona
Worthington

Group IV. (Suburban)

Anoka
Bloomington
Columbia Heights
Eden Prairie
Edina-Morningside
Forest Lake*
Fridley
Golden Valley
Hopkins
Minnetonka
Mound
Mounds View
North St. Paul
Osseo
Richfield
Robbinsdale
Rosemount
Roseville
St. Anthony Village
St. Louis Park
St. Paul Park
South St. Paul
Spring Lake Park
Wayzata
West St. Paul
White Bear Lake

Group V. (Urban)

Duluth
Minneapolis
St. Paul

---

*Elementary Questionnaire only.

School Buildings

Table A-II-1 shows the number of elementary buildings operated by the various sized school districts. These range from one building in the smallest district to seventy-four elementary schools in the Minneapolis system. Table A-II-2 shows the number of buildings operated at the secondary level. None of the small school districts operate separate junior high schools although many of the larger systems do have "Junior-Senior" high schools.

TABLE A-II-1

ELEMENTARY — Elementary School Buildings

How many separate elementary schools does your school district operate?	Percentages of school systems operating various numbers of elementary buildings.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
1	90	75	27	—	—	64
2	6	17	19	12	—	14
3	1	4	17	8	—	6
4-5	2	2	18	24	—	5
6-7	—	—	9	15	—	3
8-9	—	—	6	12	—	2
10-15	—	1	4	19	—	2
16-20	—	—	—	12	—	1
21 or more	—	1	1	—	100	1
No response	2	1	—	—	—	1

TABLE A-II-2

SECONDARY — Percentages of School Districts Operating Various Numbers of Junior (Jr.), Senior (Sr.), and Junior-Senior (Jr.-Sr.) High School Buildings

Write in the number of school buildings your school district operates.	SIZE OF SCHOOL SYSTEM															Total		
	1-35			36-99			100+			Suburban			Urban					
	Jr.	Sr.	Jr.-Sr.	Jr.	Sr.	Jr.-Sr.	Jr.	Sr.	Jr.-Sr.	Jr.	Sr.	Jr.-Sr.	Jr.	Sr.	Jr.-Sr.	Jr.	Sr.	Jr.-Sr.
1	—	4	94	2	3	97	36	37	38	28	72	12	—	—	33	11	14	82
2–3	—	—	1	1	—	—	9	2	1	60	16	—	—	33	67	5	2	2
4–5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
6–7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	33	33	—	1	1	—
8–9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	33	33	—	1	1	1
10 or more	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	33	—	—	1	—	—

Appendix III

Professional Staff

Perhaps the most important factor affecting the use of test results in a school system is the professional staff. The training and the attitude of the classroom teachers and the number and type of "specialized" support personnel are both important variables. Many specialized personnel receive specific training in the use of standardized tests and the presence or absence of these personnel in a school system can be expected to make a difference in the use of tests.

The guidance counselor generally has more formal training in standardized tests than other school personnel. There has recently been considerable discussion of the possibility of utilizing counselors at the elementary level. Table A-III-1 shows that there are only a handful of persons in Minnesota who have such assignments and it is clear that elementary school counselors cannot have much impact on the use of standardized tests in Minnesota elementary schools at this point of time.

Table A-III-2 shows quite a different story for the secondary schools where all Minnesota high schools with class sizes of 100 or more have at least one full-time guidance counselor. Although none of the schools with class sizes under 35 have a full-time guidance counselor, over two-thirds have at least one person assigned to that function part time. It is important to note, however, that almost 60 per cent of all Minnesota high schools do not have a full-time guidance counselor.

Tables A-III-3 and A-III-4 give an indication of the availability of school psychologists assigned. As can be seen from the tables, the total number of school psychologists in Minnesota is not great.*

---

*The data in Tables A-III-4 and A-III-6 are contaminated because of a flaw in this question in the secondary school questionnaire which asked for, "the number of persons your school district has assigned . . .", whereas the same question in the elementary school questionnaire limits the response to the elementary level saying, "the number of persons your school district has at the elementary level . . .".

Tables A-III-5 and A-III-6 show the percentages of schools having full and part-time social workers. It is apparent that social workers are in even shorter supply than school psychologists in Minnesota school systems.

TABLE A-III-1

ELEMENTARY — Persons Assigned as Elementary School Counselors

Write in the number of persons your school district has assigned at the elementary level as school counselor(s). NUMBER OF COUNSELORS	Percentages of school systems reporting persons in their school district assigned as elementary school counselors.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Full-Time:						
0	100	99	100	100	67	99
1	—	—	—	—	—	—
2	—	1	—	—	33	*
3	—	—	—	—	—	—
Part-Time:						
0	94	94	94	96	67	94
1	6	5	4	4	33	5
2	—	1	2	—	—	*
3	—	—	—	—	—	—

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE A-III-2

SECONDARY — Persons Assigned as Guidance Counselors

Write in the number of persons your school district has assigned as guidance counselor(s). NUMBER OF GUIDANCE COUNSELORS	Percentages of school systems reporting persons in their school district assigned as guidance counselors.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Full-Time:						
0	100	67	—	—	—	59
1	—	32	43	8	—	23
2-3	—	2	36	16	—	9
4-5	—	—	10	20	—	4
6-7	—	—	4	8	—	1
8-9	—	—	1	12	—	*
10 or more	—	—	1	36	100	3
Part-Time:						
0	27	44	67	76	33	47
1	66	50	22	12	—	46
2-3	6	6	8	12	33	7
4-5	—	—	1	—	33	*
6-7	—	—	—	—	—	—
8-9	—	—	1	—	—	*
10 or more	—	—	—	—	—	—

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE A-III-3

ELEMENTARY — Persons Assigned as School Psychologists

Write in the number of persons your school district has assigned at the elementary level as school psychologist(s).	Percentages of school systems reporting persons in their school district assigned as elementary school psychologists.					
	Size of School System					Total
NUMBER OF PSYCHOLOGISTS	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Full-Time:						
0	100	100	100	42	—	96
1	—	—	—	35	—	2
2-3	—	—	—	16	—	1
4-5	—	—	—	4	100	1
Part-Time:						
0	91	82	71	38	33	80
1	9	18	29	54	33	20
2-3	—	—	—	8	33	1

TABLE A-III-4

SECONDARY — Persons Assigned as School Psychologists

Write in the number of persons your school district has assigned as school psychologist(s). NUMBER OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGISTS	Percentages of school systems reporting persons in their school district assigned as school psychologists.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Full-Time:						
0	100	100	96	36	67	95
1	—	—	4	48	—	4
2-3	—	—	—	16	—	1
4-5	—	—	—	—	33	*
Part-Time:						
0	91	87	78	68	33	86
1	9	13	22	24	33	14
2-3	—	—	—	8	—	14
4-9	—	—	—	—	—	—
10 or more	—	—	—	—	33	*

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE A-III-6

SECONDARY — Persons Assigned as Social Workers

Write in the number of persons your school district has assigned as social worker(s) (visiting teacher).	Percentages of school systems reporting persons in their school district assigned as social workers.					
	Size of School System					Total
NUMBER OF SOCIAL WORKERS	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Full-Time:						
0	100	99	98	80	67	99
1	—	1	2	12	—	1
2-3	—	—	—	8	—	1
4-9	—	—	—	—	—	—
10 or more	—	—	—	—	33	*
Part-Time:						
0	96	98	96	92	33	97
1	4	2	4	8	—	3
2-3	—	—	—	—	—	—
4-9	—	—	—	—	33	*
10 or more	—	—	—	—	33	*

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

Appendix IV

Kindergartens

The percentages of systems operating full-time kindergartens are shown in Table A-IV-1. In general, the larger school systems are more likely to operate a full-time kindergarten, although it is interesting that almost one-fourth of the suburban districts do not have full-time kindergartens.

TABLE A-IV-1

ELEMENTARY — Kindergarten

Does your school operate a full-year kindergarten?	Percentages of school systems operating a full-year kindergarten.					
	Size of School System					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Yes	11	46	85	77	100	46
No or no response	89	54	15	23	—	54

Appendix V

Effect of PTA on Testing Programs

In some parts of the United States the Congress of Parents and Teachers (PTA) is often concerned with the development and conduct of school testing programs. The perceptions of the situation in Minnesota are shown in Tables A-V-1, A-V-2, and A-V-3. Although these responses reflect only the opinions of the persons completing the questionnaire, it seems clear that PTA's are more active at the elementary than at the secondary level, and, for whatever activity they do have, they do not affect testing programs in any significant way. Nine-tenths of Minnesota school systems either have no PTA's or report that their PTA's have no effect on the testing program.

TABLE A-V-1

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY — Activity of PTA

How active (proportion of parents involved and/or frequency of meetings) is the Parent-Teacher Association?	Percentages of school systems reporting various levels of activity for their PTA.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
ELEMENTARY						
Very active..................	9	9	13	35	—	11
Moderately active............	52	48	51	54	100	51
Only slightly active..........	27	30	24	12	—	26
There is no PTA..............	9	13	12	—	—	11
No response..................	3	1	—	—	—	1
SECONDARY						
Very active..................	6	3	2	4	33	4
Moderately active............	57	43	29	56	67	45
Only slightly active..........	28	39	42	40	—	36
There is no PTA..............	9	15	27	—	—	15
No response..................	—	1	—	—	—	1

TABLE A-V-2

ELEMENTARY — Effect of PTA on Testing Program

In which one of the following ways has the Parent-Teacher Association had the greatest effect on your school's testing program during the last five years?	Percentages of school systems reporting various effects of PTA on testing program.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
It has had no effect at all	83	84	78	88	100	83
It has caused an increase in the program	4	1	6	—	—	3
It has caused a decrease in the program	1	—	—	—	—	—
It has changed the program in some other way	—	—	1	8	1	1
There is no PTA	10	13	11	—	—	11
No response	2	—	4	4	—	2

TABLE A-V-3

SECONDARY — Effect of PTA on Testing Program

In which one of the following ways has the Parent-Teacher Association had the greatest effect on your school's testing program during the last five years?	Percentages of school systems reporting various effects of PTA on testing program.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
It has had no effect at all	79	81	73	100	100	80
It has caused an increase in the program	8	2	3	—	—	4
It has caused a decrease in the program	1	—	—	—	—	1
It has changed the program in some other way	2	2	—	—	—	2
There is no PTA	8	13	22	—	—	12
No response	2	2	2	—	—	2

Appendix VI

Ability Grouping

The nature and extent of ability grouping in Minnesota school systems could be expected to have an effect on the nature of testing programs and on the uses of test scores. Tables A-VI-1 and A-VI-2 show the extent of ability grouping in the placement of students into classrooms. Although there is much discussion of ability grouping among professional educators and by the lay public, it is obvious that Minnesota schools do very little ability grouping in the placement of students into particular classrooms. Four-fifths of Minnesota elementary systems report that they either do no grouping of this kind or they make a conscious effort

TABLE A-VI-1

ELEMENTARY — Ability Grouping in Assignment to Classroom

Are children in your school assigned to class rooms according to their abilities or aptitudes?	Percentages of school systems reporting grouping practice as indicated.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Yes, this is done in order to keep classes as heterogeneous as possible	5	18	28	38	—	18
Yes, gifted students only	1	1	2	—	—	1
Yes, slow learners only	5	4	3	12	33	5
Yes, gifted and slow learners	2	6	8	—	33	5
Yes, some are assigned for some specific aptitude or program such as music, foreign language, etc.	2	9	2	8	—	5
No	80	59	55	42	33	62
No response	6	3	—	—	—	3

to keep the classes as heterogeneous as possible. A small number of school systems do have classrooms for slow and gifted learners at the elementary level.

At the secondary level there is a tendency for larger school systems, and particularly the suburban systems, to use ability grouping in placement of pupils into particular classes. Notice that most of the suburban schools group students by ability for assignment to classrooms at the secondary level, yet at the elementary level none of them reported grouping gifted children and only 12 per cent said they grouped slow learners.

Once students are placed into classrooms, the great majority of elementary schools report that they practice ability grouping

TABLE A-VI-2

SECONDARY — Ability Grouping in Assignment to Classroom

In general, are students in your school assigned to sections or classes according to their abilities or aptitudes?	Percentages of school systems reporting grouping practice as indicated.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Yes, most or all students in most or all sections	5	12	14	4	—	10
Yes, most or all students in some sections	9	23	33	20	33	21
Yes, gifted students only	—	2	1	—	—	1
Yes, slow learners only	2	4	2	4	—	3
Yes, gifted and slow learners	2	—	9	36	—	5
Yes, some are assigned for some specific aptitude or program such as music, foreign language, etc.	16	24	14	12	33	19
No	63	27	12	8	—	33
Some combination of above responses	2	9	14	12	33	8
No response	—	—	—	4	—	1

within the classroom. As illustrated by Table A-VI-3, over four-fifths of the schools group children for reading within the classroom and over one-third group in arithmetic.

Because of the nature of the question, information about ability grouping within the classroom at the secondary level as shown in Table A-VI-4 is not as clear. Only the suburban schools report any appreciable amount of within-classroom grouping and only one-fifth of these are doing so.

TABLE A-VI-3

ELEMENTARY — Ability Grouping Within Classroom

Are children grouped for instructional purposes according to their abilities or aptitudes? (Per cent answering "yes")	Percentages of school systems reporting grouping for instruction.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Reading	76	85	88	85	67	83
Arithmetic	27	40	38	46	33	36
Spelling	10	17	17	8	—	14
Social Studies	5	7	9	8	—	7
Science	5	7	9	4	—	7
Art	2	3	1	4	—	3
Other	2	4	8	—	—	4

TABLE A-VI-4

SECONDARY — Ability Grouping Within the Classroom

Are students grouped *within* classes (or sections) according to their abilities or aptitudes for instructional purposes?	Percentages of school systems reporting grouping practices as indicated.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Yes, most or all students in all classes (or sections)............	2	4	8	—	—	4
Yes, most or all students in some classes......................	7	17	7	20	—	12
Yes, gifted students only.........	—	1	3	—	—	1
Yes, slow learners only...........	2	2	4	—	—	2
Yes, gifted and slow learners.....	3	1	4	4	—	3
Yes, but only for specific projects.	5	11	13	20	33	10
No............................	80	62	59	48	33	66
Some combination of above responses......................	1	2	1	8	33	2

Appendix VII

Information Maintained in Pupil Records

Most educators share the opinion that students benefit in direct proportion to the amount of accurate and relevant information known about them by their counselors and teachers. For this reason schools maintain student records which typically contain much information in addition to the usual record of courses taken and marks achieved. Most Minnesota schools have a dual record system consisting of a "permanent" record which is usually maintained in the central administrative office, and a "cumulative" folder which is generally kept in the guidance office or in the principal's office in the smaller systems.

Tables A-VII-1 and A-VII-2 show that schools universally record information about school performance, aptitude for learning, and, usually, health. Beyond this there are significant differences between the elementary and secondary level in the kinds of information kept. Secondary schools are more apt to record personality and related information oriented toward the future, such as ambitions and interests. Almost without exception, secondary schools maintain records of participation in school-sponsored, non-academic activities although by contrast less than one-half of the elementary schools say that they keep this information. Larger schools tend to keep more information than the smaller systems, even though they have to keep track of many more students. This could be related to availability of counselors and clerical help, although certainly another factor is that personnel in the smaller systems are more personally familiar with their pupils and their families and do not feel the need to have as much of this information in writing.

TABLE A-VII-1

ELEMENTARY — Information in Cumulative Records

Do the individual pupil records ("Cumulative" or "Permanent" records) at your school contain information for each pupil in these areas? (Do not include information contained in psychologist or counselor notes)	Percentages of school systems recording various kinds of information in cumulative records.					
	Size of School System					Total
(Per cent answering "yes")	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Performance in school subjects	98	98	97	96	100	98
Family and home life	50	63	72	65	—	61
Non-academic skills and abilities	40	39	48	62	100	43
Intelligence and academic skills and aptitudes	93	95	96	88	100	94
Fears and worries	19	24	35	19	67	24
Aesthetic and artistic abilities	31	31	48	31	100	35
Aspirations and ambitions	10	13	21	15	100	14
Interests	31	33	42	31	100	35
Personality and character	63	73	71	77	67	69
Health	89	89	89	81	100	89
Participation in school-sponsored, non-classroom activities, (athletics, band, etc.)	56	40	51	42	100	47
Participation in activities not sponsored by the school, (4-H, Boy Scouts, etc.)	13	8	10	19	67	11
Other	6	7	15	15	—	9

TABLE A-VII-2

SECONDARY — Information in Cumulative Records

Do the individual pupil records ("Cumulative" or "Permanent" records) at your school contain information for most of your pupils in these areas? (Do not include information contained in counselor's case notes)	Percentages of school systems recording various kinds of information in cumulative records.					
	Size of School System					Total
(Per cent answering "yes")	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Performance in school subjects....	99	99	100	100	100	99
Family and home life............	37	48	77	72	—	51
Non-academic skills and abilities..	59	60	68	80	67	63
Intelligence and academic aptitudes......................	97	99	100	100	100	99
Aesthetic and artistic abilities....	27	23	34	60	67	29
Aspirations and ambitions........	34	55	78	92	67	56
Interests........................	59	76	96	96	67	76
Personality and character........	75	78	88	92	67	80
Health..........................	91	84	79	84	100	85
Participation in school-sponsored, non-academic activities (athletics, band, dramatics, etc.)	95	96	98	100	100	97
Participation in activities not sponsored by the school (4-H, Boy Scouts, etc.)..............	20	26	52	68	67	34
Other...........................	8	4	14	24	—	8

Appendix VIII

Practices in Reporting Pupil Progress to Parents

Schools were asked to indicate the primary method of reporting to parents. Expecting that practices at the junior-high level might differ from elementary and senior-high schools, information was sought separately for all three levels. As shown in Tables A-VIII-1, A-VIII-2, and A-VIII-3, the report card is clearly the most common method of reporting to parents, with over 85 per cent of the schools using this method in high school and about two-thirds in elementary. Another 10 per cent of the high schools give out report cards at Parent-Teacher conferences while this is done in one-fourth of the elementary districts. Parent-Teacher conferences are more commonly held in the smaller schools. In about ninety-five per cent of the schools in the three categories of largest schools, the report card is the primary method of reporting to parents at the junior and senior-high school levels, but few parents of high school students ever receive more than a report card report from their school.

Since all reports of student progress have to be stated in terms of some reference standard or group, an attempt was made to get at the marking practices in Minnesota schools with the questions reported in Tables A-VIII-4 and A-VIII-5. Although these data should reflect the marking philosophy of the school to some extent they must be interpreted with caution since they report only the *opinions* of the person filling out the questionnaire. Even so, it is evident that standards set by the classroom teachers are the most common reference against which students' achievement is compared. An exception is suburban elementary systems where the pupil himself and his classmates are more often used for comparison. Almost half of the elementary schools report achievement relative to the student's own level of mental ability although this is done in only about one-fifth of the secondary schools. System-wide standards for comparison are less common in the larger systems although over one-half of the schools say they report achievement in these terms.

TABLE A-VIII-1

ELEMENTARY — Method of Reporting to Parents

What is the *primary* method of reporting to your parents?	Percentages of school systems using various methods of reporting to parents.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Report cards	70	68	63	62	33	67
Written report or letter from teacher	—	—	—	—	—	—
Parent-Teacher conferences	1	2	1	12	33	2
Parent-Teacher conferences at which report card is given out	26	22	26	19	33	23
Other	2	8	—	8	—	5
No response	1	—	1	—	—	1

TABLE A-VIII-2

SECONDARY — Method of Reporting to Parents, Junior High

What is the *primary* method of reporting to your parents of students in Grades 7-9?	Percentages of school systems using various methods of reporting to parents of Junior High students.					
	Size of School System					Total
Report cards	79	87	96	96	100	87
Written report or letter from teacher	—	—	—	—	—	—
Parent-Teacher conferences	—	1	—	—	—	1
Parent-Teacher conferences at which report card is given out	19	10	1	4	—	10
Other	—	2	—	—	—	1
No response	2	—	3	—	—	1

Practices of providing parents with information about their children's aptitude for learning are quite different at the elementary and secondary levels. Tables A-VIII-6 and A-VIII-7 show that almost 70 per cent of the elementary schools routinely provide parents with this information, whereas slightly over one-fourth of the secondary schools do so regularly. Generally, high school personnel are willing to provide parents with the information, but only if the parent or a member of the school staff takes the initiative. Very few schools say they never provide parents with information about their children's aptitude for learning.

TABLE A-VIII-3

SECONDARY — Method of Reporting to Parents, Senior High

What is the *primary* method of reporting to your parents of students in Grades 10-12?	Percentages of school systems using various methods of reporting to parents of Senior High students.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Report cards	79	87	96	92	67	86
Written report or letter from teacher	1	—	—	—	—	1
Parent-Teacher conferences	—	1	—	—	—	1
Parent-Teacher conferences at which report card is given out	19	10	1	4	—	10
Other	—	2	—	—	—	1
No response	2	—	3	4	33	2

TABLE A-VIII-4

ELEMENTARY — Reports to Parents

Are the following types of report card marks or verbal reports *regularly* given to parents of your pupils?	Percentages of School Systems Giving Various Types of Reports to Parents.											
	REPORT CARD MARKS						OTHER REPORTS					
	Size of School System					Total	Size of School System					Total
Marks or reports that show the level of a student's achievement relative to:	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban		1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Standards set by his *teacher*..........	59	65	67	35	67	61	27	37	46	62	33	38
Standards set by the school *system*.....	68	54	55	50	—	58	26	27	37	35	33	29
The average *achievement* in his *class* group........................	50	50	55	58	67	52	33	36	43	65	67	39
His *own* level of *mental ability*........	35	45	49	54	100	44	33	44	54	73	33	44
His *own* level of *effort*................	32	58	66	46	67	55	40	49	55	58	67	48

TABLE A-VIII-5

SECONDARY — Reports to Parents

Are the following types of report card marks or verbal reports *regularly* given to parents of your pupils?	Percentages of School Systems Giving Various Types of Reports to Parents.											
	REPORT CARD MARKS						OTHER REPORTS					
	Size of School System					Total	Size of School System					Total
Marks or reports that show the level of a student's achievement relative to:	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban		1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Standards set by his *teacher*..........	63	74	77	64	67	71	23	26	34	36	33	27
Standards set by the school *system*.....	60	51	48	48	—	53	30	20	24	20	—	24
The average *achievement* in his *class* group..........................	44	39	35	28	33	39	15	18	23	20	67	19
His *own* level of *mental ability*........	23	19	18	12	67	20	25	24	25	32	33	25
His *own* level of *effort*................	54	52	49	24	33	50	28	32	36	36	33	32

TABLE A-VIII-6

ELEMENTARY — Parents Told Pupil's Aptitude for Learning

To what extent are the parents of pupils in your school provided with information about their children's aptitudes for learning school subjects?	Percentages of school systems providing parents with information about their children's aptitude.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
1) This is never done	5	3	1	4	—	3
2) This is done only if the parents specially request it	3	5	11	4	—	6
3) This is done only if a teacher, counselor, or principal takes the initiative	4	5	2	8	—	4
4) Both 2) and 3)	8	18	22	27	67	17
5) This is done routinely on all report cards and/or in parent-teacher conferences	78	69	62	58	33	69
6) No response	2	—	1	—	—	1

TABLE A-VIII-7

SECONDARY — Parents Told Pupil's Aptitude for Learning

To what extent are the parents of pupils in your school provided with information about their children's aptitudes for learning school subjects?	Percentages of school systems providing parents with information about their children's aptitude.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
1) This is never done	—	1	—	—	—	—
2) This is done if the parents specially request it	12	9	13	4	—	10
3) This is done if a teacher, counselor, or principal takes the initiative in doing it for individual pupils	7	4	4	4	—	5
4) Both 2) and 3)	40	59	63	60	67	54
5) This is done routinely on all report cards and/or in the parent-teacher conferences	39	28	19	24	33	27
6) No response	2	—	1	8	—	1

Appendix IX

Assignment of the High School Principal to Counseling and Guidance

Not one of the 128 smallest schools has a full-time guidance counselor, and two-thirds of those with class sizes 36-99 do not (Table A-III-2). Since most small schools do not employ a full-time guidance counselor and since most do not have anyone on the staff with formal training in guidance and counseling, it is common practice to specifically assign these duties to the high school principal. The extent to which school districts have high school principals with time specifically assigned to guidance counseling is shown in Table A-IX-1. Two-thirds of the smallest systems report the secondary principal so engaged, but the use of principals in this capacity drops off rapidly as school size increases.

A second question asked whether principals with specific assignments to guidance had completed at least one graduate course in testing or test interpretation. Virtually all schools said this was the case.

TABLE A-IX-1

SECONDARY — Principal Assigned to Guidance and Counseling

Does the principal have any time specifically assigned to counseling and guidance?	Percentages of school systems reporting time specifically assigned to the principal for counseling and guidance.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Yes	63	38	9	—	—	36
No or no response	37	62	91	100	100	64

Appendix X

High School Remedial and Developmental Reading Programs

Because of their possible implications for high school testing, several questions about the high school remedial and developmental reading programs were included.

An indication of the availability of remedial reading teachers in Minnesota high schools can be found in Table A-X-1. Almost 60 per cent of Minnesota high schools have no remedial reading teacher even part time and only one-fifth have one full time.

The percentages shown in Table A-X-2 show that only one-third of Minnesota high schools have a formal unit or course devoted specifically to developmental reading. Whether or not a school has a developmental reading program is clearly a function of school size—only 16 per cent of the smallest size schools include such a unit compared with 68 per cent of the suburban and urban systems.

The grade levels at which developmental reading units are placed are shown in Table A-X-3.*

The seventh grade is the most usual level for high school developmental reading units. The eighth grade is the next most popular grade, with over 10 per cent of the schools having one in the senior year.

Table A-X-4 shows the length of developmental reading units. The percentages are based upon the total number of units, not schools. Lengths tend to follow the normal six and nine-week

---

*Table A-X-3 tabulates percentages based on schools reporting at least one developmental reading unit in their curriculum. Thus, for example, we find that 83 per cent of schools which have any developmental reading unit have one at the seventh grade; the table should not be interpreted as saying that 83 per cent of all Minnesota high schools have a developmental reading unit in seventh grade.

Since many schools have more than one unit, the percentages in some columns may total more than 100.

TABLE A-X-1

SECONDARY—Persons Assigned as Remedial Reading Teachers

How many persons does your system have assigned to work with individual pupils in *remedial* reading? NUMBER OF REMEDIAL READING TEACHERS	Percentages of school systems reporting persons in their school district assigned as remedial reading teachers.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Full-Time:						
0	84	84	65	60	—	78
1	11	14	22	20	—	15
2	—	1	10	8	—	3
3-5	1	—	1	8	—	2
6-8	—	—	—	—	33	*
9 or more	—	—	1	—	33	*
Part-Time:						
0	68	49	63	80	—	59
1	24	40	23	8	—	30
2	4	8	12	—	—	8
3-5	2	3	1	4	—	2
6-8	—	—	1	—	—	*
9 or more	—	—	—	—	33	*

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE A-X-2

SECONDARY — Developmental Reading Course

Does your curriculum include a formal unit or course devoted *specifically* to developmental reading instruction? (Not remedial reading)	Percentages of school systems reporting a course devoted to developmental reading instruction.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Yes	16	23	55	68	67	30
No or no response	84	77	45	32	33	70

TABLE A-X-3

SECONDARY — Grade Placement of Developmental Reading Units

If your curriculum includes a specific Developmental Reading unit, at what grade(s)?	Percentages of school systems having one or more developmental reading units which operate a unit at various grade levels.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
7th Grade	71	88	84	88	50	83
8th Grade	48	60	40	65	—	50
9th Grade	19	7	8	6	—	9
10th Grade	5	—	16	12	50	9
11th Grade	—	2	—	—	—	1
12th Grade	33	5	10	—	100	12

marking periods. Most of the developmental reading units are of nine weeks or greater duration.

Some schools include only a part of the student body in the developmental reading program. Table A-X-5 shows that 59 per cent of all reading units enroll 71 per cent or more of the class. A fair number of school systems also have developmental reading units which enroll only a small portion of the class.

The use of standardized test scores with developmental reading units is shown in Table A-X-6, where we see that test scores are used to select or place pupils in 58 per cent of the units.

TABLE A-X-4

SECONDARY — Length of Developmental Reading Units

If your curriculum includes a specific developmental reading unit, what is its length in weeks?	Percentages of developmental reading units of various lengths.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
One-Two	4	—	—	7	—	2
Three-Four	—	—	11	10	—	7
Five-Six	14	5	18	3	100	12
Seven-Eight	7	5	—	—	—	3
Nine and longer	75	90	71	79	—	78

TABLE A-X-5

SECONDARY — Proportion of Pupils Included in Developmental Reading Units

If your curriculum includes a specific developmental reading unit, what per cent of pupils are included?	Percentages of developmental reading units which include various percentages of pupils.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
1-10%	15	8	8	—	—	8
11-20%	15	17	9	—	—	11
21-30%	21	8	—	4	25	7
31-40%	6	8	1	7	—	4
41-50%	9	5	9	19	—	9
51-60%	—	2	3	—	—	1
61-70%	—	—	—	7	—	1
71-80% or more	35	54	71	63	75	59

TABLE A-X-6

SECONDARY — Use of Test Scores in Developmental Reading Unit

If your curriculum includes a specific developmental reading unit, are standardized reading tests used to select or place pupils in this unit?	Percentages of developmental reading units in which test scores are used to select or place students.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Yes	76	48	57	61	100	58

High School "Guidance" or "Occupational" Units*

Many schools have occupations or guidance units, typically as part of the Social Studies curriculum. That such units are common in Minnesota high schools is demonstrated in Table A-XI-1, which shows that 86 per cent of the high schools have them. The larger systems are more apt to have a guidance unit and all of the suburban and urban schools have one.

Table A-XI-2 shows that most schools have their guidance units at the ninth grade level, although almost half of the schools which have at least one unit have one in the senior year also.** The effect of school size on the grade placement of occupational

---

*Another Minnesota study by John L. Sanstead dealt with this topic in greater detail. Unpublished M. A. Paper, University of Minnesota, 1966.

**Table A-XI-2 tabulates percentages based on schools reporting at least one guidance unit in their curriculum. Thus, for example, we find that 89 per cent of schools which have any guidance unit have one at the ninth grade. The table should not be interpreted as saying that 89 per cent of all Minnesota high schools have a guidance unit in ninth grade.

Since many schools have more than one unit the percentages in some columns may total more than 100.

TABLE A-XI-1

SECONDARY — Guidance or Occupational Units

Does your curriculum (Grades 7-12) include any specific "Guidance" or "Occupations" units?	Percentages of school systems having specific "Guidance" or "Occupations" units.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Yes	71	89	98	100	100	86
No or no response	29	11	2	—	—	14

units is interesting. The larger systems are more likely to have a unit at ninth grade than the smaller systems, whereas the smaller schools have an occupational unit included at the twelfth grade level much more often than the larger ones.

TABLE A-XI-2

SECONDARY — Grade Placement of Guidance Units

If your curriculum includes a specific "Guidance" or "Occupations" unit, at what grade(s)?	Percentages of school systems units which operate a unit at the various grade levels.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
7th Grade	2	4	—	4	—	3
8th Grade	—	2	4	4	—	2
9th Grade	76	89	96	92	—	89
10th Grade	1	2	1	—	67	2
11th Grade	3	3	8	4	33	4
12th Grade	61	51	33	31	33	49

The distribution of the lengths of guidance units is shown in Table A-XI-3. The modal length is six weeks, undoubtedly reflecting the length of the marking periods in many schools. There is considerable variation in the length of guidance units, particularly within the range from one to nine weeks.

One would expect that test scores would play a significant part in most guidance units. Table A-XI-4 shows this is true although the large number of guidance units which do not include a look at test scores as part of the unit is somewhat surprising. The guidance units in the larger system are much more apt to use test results.

TABLE A-XI-3

SECONDARY — Length of Guidance Units

If your curriculum includes a spe- "Guidance" or "Occupations" unit, what is its length in weeks?	Percentages of "Guidance" units operating for various numbers of weeks.					
	Size of School System					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	Total
One	5	5	7	6	—	5
Two	16	16	12	15	—	15
Three	20	20	16	9	50	18
Four	15	15	11	12	25	14
Five	5	5	6	12	—	4
Six	27	27	26	26	—	26
Seven-Nine	13	13	18	12	25	13
Ten and longer	—	6	5	9	—	5

TABLE A-XI-4

SECONDARY — Use of Test Scores in Guidance Unit

If your curriculum includes a specific "Guidance" or "Occupations" unit, are test scores reported to pupils and/or parents as part of the unit?	Percentages of "Guidance" units in which test scores are reported.					
	Size of School System					Total
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urban	
Yes	43	59	65	88	25	58

Appendix XII

How Users First Heard of Their Tests

Respondents were asked to indicate, for each test used, how they, the respondent, first heard of the particular test. Table A-XII-1 tabulates their replies. The table groups tests and grades in the same manner as the data in Chapters 4 and 5.

There are rather substantial differences in how respondents first came in contact with their Reading Readiness tests between kindergarten and first grade. Professional meetings and catalogs are the two most important sources of information for kindergarten while college courses and a new school system are most important at the first grade.

The rather substantial differences between elementary and secondary in their reports of how scholastic aptitude tests first came to their attention could possibly be attributed to the fact that most of the elementary questionnaires were filled in by principals while counselors completed most of the secondary questionnaires. Counselors were more apt to first hear of scholastic aptitude tests at professional meetings or from a catalog while elementary principals more usually learned of these tests in college courses or first ran into them when they entered a new school system. These differences between elementary and secondary do not show up with achievement batteries where the responses at the two levels are nearly the same.

The responses for all of the other tests, mostly those used at the high school level, are nearly the same with professional meetings and catalogs being the primary source of first contact with the tests.

TABLE A-XII-1

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY—How Users First Heard of Their Tests

Percentages of respondents reporting various ways in which they first heard of various tests used at selected grades.

How did *you* hear of the test the *first* time?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Reading Readiness, K						Reading Readiness, 1						Reading, K-3						Reading, 4-6					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Was in system when I came	—	6	2	—	—	3	35	21	30	23	25	27	21	24	26	29	—	24	11	22	16	59	—	19
Professional meeting or convention	35	34	33	27	—	33	4	6	17	15	—	8	4	8	13	10	—	8	4	9	25	6	—	10
A colleague told me about it	4	9	9	—	—	8	2	3	3	8	—	3	5	5	4	5	—	5	6	4	8	18	—	6
Article, review, or adv. in prof'l pub. (incl. Buros' MMY)	12	9	5	18	—	9	4	3	3	8	—	4	—	7	7	—	—	4	1	7	1	—	—	4
College course	—	4	13	—	—	6	24	33	20	31	—	27	36	39	31	48	100	37	47	47	32	12	—	43
Publisher's catalog or bulletin	27	26	25	36	—	27	2	11	3	8	75	8	7	6	6	5	—	6	2	3	—	—	—	2
Dept. of Educ. consultant	4	6	7	—	—	6	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	*	—	—	—	—	—	—
State-Wide Testing consultant	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	1
Publisher's salesman	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	4	7	—	—	4	1	3	6	—	—	3	3	2	4	—	—	2
Other	—	—	2	9	—	1	2	7	10	8	—	6	6	4	7	—	—	5	7	2	4	—	—	4
No Response	19	5	4	9	—	7	24	11	7	—	—	13	21	3	1	4	—	8	18	4	9	6	—	9
	Scholastic Aptitude, K-3						Scholastic Aptitude, 4-6						Scholastic Aptitude, 7-9						Scholastic Aptitude, 10-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Was in system when I came	33	38	26	31	—	33	31	40	25	40	—	34	3	1	1	3	—	2	2	4	—	—	—	2
Professional meeting or convention	2	5	18	13	—	8	1	5	14	10	—	6	46	39	39	33	—	41	43	32	30	56	—	37
A colleague told me about it	5	4	4	8	—	5	4	4	4	10	—	4	1	3	4	3	—	3	4	4	5	4	—	4
Article, review, or adv. in prof'l pub. (incl. Buros' MMY)	1	3	4	5	—	3	—	1	4	2	20	2	2	4	3	5	—	3	4	8	2	4	—	5
College course	39	33	26	38	—	33	40	30	33	31	—	33	—	2	5	5	50	2	4	1	8	4	—	4
Publisher's catalog or bulletin	5	3	6	—	—	4	5	3	5	—	20	4	26	34	37	36	—	32	26	35	38	28	—	33
Dept. of Educ. consultant	—	4	1	—	—	2	1	3	1	—	—	2	3	3	1	5	—	2	8	1	—	4	—	3
State-Wide Testing consultant	1	2	—	—	—	1	1	3	—	—	—	1	6	2	1	3	—	3	4	—	—	—	—	1
Publisher's salesman	2	—	4	3	—	2	1	*	4	—	—	1	7	11	8	3	—	8	2	6	5	—	—	4
Other	4	1	4	—	—	3	4	2	5	5	—	4	1	2	—	—	—	1	2	5	2	—	—	3
No Response	8	6	6	3	100	7	12	8	5	2	60	9	5	*	2	5	50	3	2	4	11	—	100	5

*Less than one-half of one per cent.

TABLE A-XII-1 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY—How Users First Heard of Their Tests

Percentages of respondents reporting various ways in which they first heard of various tests used at selected grades.

How did *you* hear of the test the *first* time?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																							
	Achievement Batteries, K-3						Achievement Batteries, 4-6						Achievement Batteries, 7-8						Achievement Batteries, 9-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Was in system when I came	7	4	1	16	—	4	6	2	2	4	—	3	9	3	—	—	—	4	2	1	2	—	—	2
Professional meeting or convention	29	30	26	13	—	27	28	33	34	27	—	31	44	40	42	21	—	40	39	39	32	29	—	37
A colleague told me about it	9	10	13	22	—	11	8	10	12	12	—	10	3	2	1	4	—	2	5	3	4	14	—	4
Article, review, or adv. in prof'l pub. (incl. Buros' MMY)	3	6	7	7	—	5	4	2	5	6	—	4	5	6	6	—	—	5	2	2	2	—	—	2
College course	—	4	8	—	—	3	1	4	3	—	22	3	—	6	8	25	40	7	1	2	2	4	60	2
Publisher's catalog or bulletin	36	36	24	31	33	33	33	36	25	48	11	33	17	33	27	25	—	26	28	37	39	41	—	35
Dept. of Educ. consultant	4	2	9	—	33	4	3	1	6	—	56	3	7	3	7	8	20	6	3	2	2	—	—	2
State-Wide Testing consultant	—	3	—	—	—	1	—	4	—	—	—	2	—	3	—	—	—	1	6	3	1	—	—	3
Publisher's salesman	—	1	1	—	—	1	1	2	1	—	—	1	3	2	—	4	—	2	9	8	8	6	—	8
Other	1	2	6	4	—	3	2	—	6	—	—	2	5	1	2	4	—	2	2	1	1	—	—	1
No Response	9	3	6	7	33	6	14	5	5	4	11	8	6	2	6	8	40	5	3	2	6	6	40	3

	Reading Tests, 7-12						Multi-Aptitude Batteries, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Was in system when I came	5	3	2	8	—	4	—	1	1	4	—	1
Professional meeting or convention	4	34	26	17	—	24	43	34	27	20	33	34
A colleague told me about it	18	2	6	10	—	7	7	3	3	16	—	5
Article, review, or adv. in prof'l pub. (incl. Buros' MMY)	32	3	12	13	—	12	1	2	1	—	—	1
College course	—	12	9	4	—	8	1	2	5	4	33	3
Publisher's catalog or bulletin	16	27	34	42	—	30	24	41	43	40	—	37
Dept. of Educ. consultant	9	4	5	—	—	5	—	—	—	—	—	—
State-Wide Testing consultant	—	2	—	—	—	1	5	1	2	4	—	3
Publisher's salesman	—	5	—	—	—	2	11	12	14	8	—	12
Other	16	—	1	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	1	8	5	6	—	5	7	3	3	4	33	4

TABLE A-XII-1 — Continued

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY—How Users First Heard of Their Tests

Percentages of respondents reporting various ways in which they first heard of various tests used at selected grades.

How did *you* hear of the test the *first* time?	TYPE OF TEST, GRADES																	
	Interest Tests, 9						Interest Tests, 12						Personality Tests, 7-12					
	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T	1-35	36-99	100+	Sub.	Urb.	T
Was in system when I came	—	1	—	—	—	1	1	1	2	—	—	1	—	5	2	—	—	3
Professional meeting or convention	41	33	40	41	—	37	41	34	16	17	—	31	42	32	14	75	—	30
A colleague told me about it	9	1	2	9	—	3	6	6	—	11	—	5	3	—	3	—	—	2
Article, review, or adv. in prof'l pub. (incl. Buros' MMY)	—	3	1	—	—	2	4	1	—	—	—	2	3	7	14	—	—	8
College course	—	3	—	5	—	2	—	2	1	6	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	1
Publisher's catalog or bulletin	32	44	46	36	—	43	21	42	61	46	—	40	21	40	50	—	—	38
Dept. of Educ. consultant	—	3	2	5	—	3	1	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	2	—	—	1
State-Wide Testing consultant	5	4	—	—	—	2	2	5	—	—	—	3	3	2	—	8	—	2
Publisher's salesman	5	1	—	—	—	1	16	7	8	9	—	10	9	10	2	—	—	6
Other	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	2	3	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
No Response	9	6	7	5	—	6	8	3	10	9	—	6	18	3	14	17	—	10

Appendix XIII

Requirements for Reimbursement for Guidance, Counseling, and Testing Under Title V-A, NDEA, 1965-66

In order to qualify for reimbursement for "Counseling and Guidance" during the 1965-66 school year, school districts had to meet the following requirements:*

1. A person employed as a counselor in a Minnesota public secondary school must have a counselor's certificate.
2. A student-counselor ratio of not over 460 to 1 for all qualified counselors must be maintained.
3. At least 50% of assigned guidance time must be utilized for actual student and parent counseling.
4. Adult paid clerical assistance shall be provided for a minimum of one day per counselor per week.
5. Counselor's office must provide a reasonable degree of privacy and should be equipped with appropriate furnishings such as desks, chairs, files, telephone, etc.
6. Schools must maintain cumulative records on each student containing information on the students' abilities, activities, and information concerning the students' family and community background, his health and aspirations. Interview notes should also be included. This cumulative record should proceed with the student from kindergarten through graduation.
7. Schools participating in the counseling and guidance program under NDEA, Title V-A, *must administer three basic tests*: two approved aptitude tests; and one approved achievement test battery .
8. A library of current occupational and educational material must be maintained. It is recommended that two units on vocational educational planning be taught, one in junior high and one in senior high.

---

*"Guide for completing the application for reimbursement of guidance, counseling and testing programs under the National Defense Education Act of 1958, Title V-A, Code: F XXXIII-C-1." Minnesota Department of Education, Guidance Unit, Revised 5/1963.

School districts could receive reimbursement for the cost of operating their testing program as follows:**

> Reimbursement of 50% will be made on the cost of purchases, rental and/or machine scoring of any or all of four tests: *aptitude* tests (scholastic or multifactor) in two grades not below grade 7, and *achievement* batteries in two grades not below grade 7. Tests must be selected from the approved list. It is not necessary to administer all four tests to be eligible for reimbursement. Reimbursement may be made on one, two, three, or four of the tests outlined above.

**Ibid.

Appendix XIV

Minnesota High School State-Wide Testing Program, 1965-66*†

The Minnesota High School State-Wide Testing Program is a testing program provided by the Student Counseling Bureau of the University of Minnesota with the advice of the Committee on High School-College Relations, a joint committee of the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals and the Association of Minnesota Colleges.

At moderate costs it provides the services of a central testing agency.

It:

- Furnishes test supplies.
- Provides scoring services.
- Reports test results.
- Develops Minnesota norms for the tests used.
- Conducts research on the meaning of test scores.
- Provides interpretive aids and consultative services to the schools.

Any Minnesota high school, public or private, may use these services.

---

*Significant changes have been made in this program since 1965-66. For current information contact: Director, Student Counseling Bureau, Office of Dean of Students, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.

†See Page 21 for a discussion of the Minnesota Scholastic Aptitude Test (MSAT), the aptitude test in the Minnesota College State-Wide Testing Program.

These tests were included in the High School Program during the 1965-66 school year:

TEST	*GRADES* 7	8	9	*AVAILABLE* 10	11	12
1. Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Tests (LTIT) Multi-Level Ed...	X	X	X			
2. Differential Aptitude Test Battery (DAT), Form A.......		X	X	X		
3. Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITED), Form 4..			X	X	X	X
4. Minnesota Counseling Inventory (MCI).......................			X	X	X	X
5. Strong Vocational Interest Blank (SVIB)						X

March, 1966

MINNESOTA TESTING SURVEY

ELEMENTARY LEVEL, GRADES 1-6

The Testing Subcommittee of the Minnesota State Board of Education's Advisory Committee on Guidance, Counseling, and Testing, with support from funds made available through the National Defense Education Act, has recently undertaken a study of the use of standardized tests in Minnesota schools. This study should do much to improve the quality and scope of future guidance and testing decisions in Minnesota schools and help them and agencies working with them to improve services provided to Minnesota students.

Minnesota educators have long felt the need for a comprehensive survey of testing practices in Minnesota schools. Despite the widespread use of tests, we still have distressingly little knowledge of the actual testing practices in our schools. Such information is practically nonexistent for Minnesota elementary schools. Agencies furnishing services to schools, such as the State Department of Education and the various colleges and universities, are constantly seeking ways to improve the quality and effectiveness of their services. Good information concerning actual testing practices can help to improve these services.

Realizing the importance of and the widespread interest in a project of this nature, we have sought counsel of the following organizations whose suggestions have been incorporated into the survey. This project has the interest and cooperation of these organizations:

Minnesota Association of School Administrators
Minnesota Elementary Principals Association
Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals
Minnesota Counselors Association

Of course, all replies will be strictly confidential and no school, counselor, or administrator will be identified in the final report.

A copy of the final report will be sent to each participating school. A second copy of the questionnaire is enclosed for your files.

We thank you in advance for your cooperation in this study. We hope and believe that this survey will result in noticeable benefits for each Minnesota high school.

Do not hesitate to contact the project director if you have any further questions or comments about this study.

Paul E. Ingwell
Dr. Paul Ingwell, Chairman
St. Cloud State College

Gary Joselyn
Gary Joselyn, Project Director
Student Counseling Bureau
University of Minnesota

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Phone: 612-373-5151

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to find out what standardized tests are used in your school and how they are used. We are interested only in published tests, such as those sold by commercial test publishers, not in tests made up and given by individual teachers in the normal course of instruction. In addition to a description of your school's standardized testing program, you are asked for some background information about your school and the pupils in your school.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR PERSONS WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR MORE THAN ONE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

The questions below are designed to gain information about testing practices for your entire school district. If your district operates more than one elementary building and if there are differences in practices between buildings, please answer the questions for one specific, "typical", building and attach an additional sheet indicating the differences in testing programs between this building and the others.

DIRECTIONS

Please place a check or fill in the information in all blanks which apply. Check more than one response if necessary in order to give full information.

1-5______________________________

School District______________________________ ______________________________
Name Number

Name of school______________________________ Phone______________________________

Name of person completing questionnaire______________________________

6. Title of person completing questionnaire:

1)______Teacher
2)______Principal
3)______Curriculum director
4)______Director of elementary education
5)______Superintendent
6)______Elementary school counselor
7)______High school guidance director (counselor)
8)______Psychologist
0)______Other (Specify:______________________________)

7. Sex: 1)______Male 2)______Female

8. How many separate elementary schools does your school district operate?

1)______1
2)______2
3)______3
4)______4
5)______5
6)______6-7
7)______8-9
8)______10-15
9)______16-20
0)______21 or more

9. Does your school operate a full year kindergarten?

1)_____Yes 2)_____No

10. If there is more than one elementary school in your district is the testing program essentially the same in each building?

1)_____Not applicable (have only one building)
2)_____Yes
3)_____No (Please attach a separate sheet of paper describing the differences)

11-20. Write in the number of persons your school district has assigned at the elementary level as:

11._____Elementary school counselor(s), full-time
12._____Elementary school counselor(s), part-time
13-14._____School psychologist(s), full-time
15-16._____School psychologist(s), part-time
17-18._____Social worker(s) (visiting teacher), full-time
19-20._____Social worker(s) (visiting teacher), part-time

21-22._____How many of those listed above as engaged in counseling, psychological work, or social work have had formal training (at least one graduate course in testing and test interpretation)?

23. If you have no persons as assigned in items 11-20, has the principal training as described above?

1)_____Yes 2)_____No

24. Are children in your school assigned to class rooms according to their abilities or aptitudes?

1)_____Yes, this is done in order to keep classes as heterogeneous as possible
2)_____Yes, gifted students only
3)_____Yes, slow learners only
4)_____Yes, gifted and slow learners
5)_____Yes, some are assigned for some specific aptitude or program such as music, foreign language, etc. (Specify:______________________________)
6)_____No

25-31. Are children grouped for instructional purposes according to their abilities or aptitudes?

	(1) Yes	(2) No		if yes, at what grade levels?
25.	___	___	Reading	__________
26.	___	___	Arithmetic	__________
27.	___	___	Spelling	__________
28.	___	___	Social Studies	__________
29.	___	___	Science	__________
30.	___	___	Art	__________
31.	___	___	Other (Specify:____________________)	

32. How active (proportion of parents involved and/or frequency of meetings) is the parent-teacher association?

1)_____Very active
2)_____Moderately active
3)_____Only slightly active
4)_____There is no parent-teacher association

33. In which one of the following ways has the Parent-Teacher Association had the greatest effect on your school's testing program during the last five years?

1)_____It has had no effect at all
2)_____It has caused an increase in the program
3)_____It has caused a decrease in the program
4)_____It has changed the program in some other way (Specify:_____________ ____)
5)_____There is no PTA

34-35. Indicate by as many check marks (✓) as needed who is or was involved in the development of your testing program as it now exists.

01)_____Testing Committee
02)_____Classroom Teacher(s)
03)_____Principal(s)
04)_____Superintendent or assistant superintendent
05)_____Director of elementary education or elementary supervisor
06)_____Curriculum director
07)_____Counselor or other pupil personnel specialist
08)_____Consultant(s) from colleges or universities
09)_____Consultant(s) from state department of education
10)_____Consultant(s) from commercial test publishers
11)_____Salesman from commercial test publisher
12)_____Reading Specialist
13)_____School Psychologist
14)_____Can't really say who was responsible for its development; it has been this way for a long time.
15)_____Other (Specify:_______________________________________)

36-37. _______ Write in the number opposite the one person(s) checked above bearing primary responsibility.

38. Do you have an elementary school testing committee which operates independently from the high school?

1)_____Yes 2)_____No

If yes, list membership by title (ie., teacher, principal, psychologist, etc.)

_____________________________ _____________________________
_____________________________ _____________________________
_____________________________ _____________________________
_____________________________ _____________________________

39. Does your district (K-12) have an active testing committee?

1)_____Yes 2)_____No

If yes, list membership by title (ie., principal, teacher, etc.)

______________________________ ______________________________

______________________________ ______________________________

______________________________ ______________________________

______________________________ ______________________________

40. Have personnel from the secondary level (other than the superintendent) participated in the development of the elementary school testing program?

1)_____Yes 2)_____No

41-45. Within this and the past two years has your school been visited by any of the following:

	(1) Yes	(2) No	
41.	___	___	Consultant from the State-Wide Testing Programs, Student Counseling Bureau, University of Minnesota (Gary Joselyn)
42.	___	___	Guidance consultant from the State Department of Education Reynold Erickson, Julius Kerlan, Dean Miller)
43.	___	___	Other consultant from the State Department of Education (Specify:______________________________)
44.	___	___	Other guidance or counseling consultant from any Minnesota college or university (Specify:____________________)
45.	___	___	Consultant from commercial test publisher (Specify:__________ ______________________________)
46.	___	___	Other consultant (Specify:____________________ ______________________________)

47. In general, how do your teachers learn of students' test scores once they are available in the school building?

1)_____Test results are placed in the files in the central office and any teacher who wishes may look them up.

2)_____Test results are placed in the files in the principal's office or in the guidance counselor's office and any teacher who wishes may learn of them in consultation with the principal or guidance counselor.

3)_____Test results are sent directly to each teacher who keeps them in his own files

4)_____Test results are completely confidential and are not available to teachers.

5)_____Other (Describe:______________________________ ______________________________)

48. How many general faculty meetings could you say are usually held each year for the primary purpose of discussing and interpreting test results?

1)_____None
2)_____One
3)_____Two
4)_____Three
5)_____Four or more

49. Is your school planning to make any significant changes in its testing program within the next year?

1)_____Yes 2)_____No

50-71. Please use the following scale for answering questions 50-69.

This change:
1) is not needed or planned
2) is needed but not planned
3) is planned but is not needed
4) is both needed and planned

Some schools are considering one or more of the changes listed below for their testing programs. For questions 50-71 write the number of the statement in the scale above that best indicates your reaction to each change suggested for your testing program.

50._____To introduce or use more reading readiness tests.
51._____To use fewer or no reading readiness tests.
52._____To introduce or use a different reading readiness test than we are now using.

53._____To introduce or use more standardized reading tests (other than tests which are part of the instructional reading program materials.)
54._____To use fewer or no reading tests.
55._____To introduce or use a different reading test than we are now using.

56._____To introduce or use more individual intelligence tests.
57._____To use fewer or no individual intelligence tests.

58._____To introduce or use more group intelligence or scholastic aptitude tests.
59._____To use fewer or no group intelligence or scholastic aptitude tests.
60._____To introduce or use a different group intelligence or scholastic aptitude test than we are now using.

61._____To introduce or use more standardized achievement test batteries.
62._____To use fewer or no standardized achievement test batteries.
63._____To introduce or use a different standardized achievement test battery than we are now using.

64._____To introduce or use more personality or character tests.
65._____To use fewer or no personality or character tests.

66._____To develop more local (school district) norms.
67._____To improve the scoring of tests.
68._____To improve the methods of recording test results
69._____To improve the processing and reporting of test results to teachers, counselors, and administrators.
70._____To improve the interpretation of test results to pupils and their parents.
71._____To improve the interpretation of test results to teachers, counselors, and administrators.

72-81. Are the following types of report card marks or verbal reports regularly given to parents of your pupils?

Report Card Marks (1) Yes	Report Card Marks (2) No	Other Reports (1) Yes	Other Reports (2) No	Marks or reports that show the level of a student's achievement relative to:
72. ___	___	77. ___	___	standards set by his teacher.
73. ___	___	78. ___	___	standards set by the school system.
74. ___	___	79. ___	___	the average achievement in his class group.
75. ___	___	80. ___	___	his own level of mental ability.
76. ___	___	81. ___	___	his own level of effort.

82. To what extent are the parents of pupils in your school provided with information about their children's aptitudes for learning school subjects?

1) ____ This is never done.
2) ____ This is done only if the parents specially request it.
3) ____ This is done only if a teacher, counselor, or principal takes the initiative.
4) ____ Both 2) and 3)
5) ____ This is done routinely on all report cards and/or in parent-teacher conferences.

83. What is the primary method of reporting to your parents?

1) ____ Report cards
2) ____ Written report or letter from teacher
3) ____ Parent-teacher conferences
4) ____ Parent-teacher conference at which report card is given out.
5) ____ Other (Specify: ______________________________)

84-96. Do the individual pupil records ("Cumulative" or "Permanent" records) at your school contain information for each pupil in these areas? (Do not include information contained in psychologist or counselor notes)

(1) Yes	(2) No	
84. ___	___	Performance in school subjects
85. ___	___	Family and home life
86. ___	___	Non-academic skills and abilities
87. ___	___	Intelligence and academic skills and aptitudes
88. ___	___	Fears and worries
89. ___	___	Aesthetic and artistic abilities
90. ___	___	Aspirations and ambitions
91. ___	___	Interests
92. ___	___	Personality and character
93. ___	___	Health
94. ___	___	Other (Specify: ______________________________)
95. ___	___	Participation in school-sponsored, non-classroom activities, (athletics, band, etc.)
96. ___	___	Participation in activities not sponsored by the school (4-H, Boy Scouts, etc.)

1. What standardized tests are routinely given, in grades K-6, in your school?

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer by writing on the appropriate line the test name and code number from the "List of Tests and Code Numbers" found in the back of this booklet. If no standardized tests are given in a grade, write "None"

EXAMPLE:

3rd grade	38	Otis
	54	Iowa Tests of Basic Skills

		Code No.		
Pre-school	1			
Kinder-garten	2			(Do not write in this space)
1st grade	3			
2nd grade	4			
3rd grade	5			
4th grade	6			
5th grade	7			
6th grade	8			

2. Approximately what proportion of the pupils in the grade take the test?

1) More than 95%
2) 75-94%
3) 50-74%
4) 25-49%
5) Less than 24%
6) Only a small number of selected pupils

NOTE: Be sure to answer for each test listed on the opposite page.

3. How often is the test given?

1) Once each year
2) Twice each year
3) More than two times a year
4) Once every other year
5) Some other regular schedule (Specify below)
6) Irregularly

4. When is the test given?

1) In the fall
2) In the winter
3) In the spring
4) Both fall and spring
5) Both winter and spring
6) Both fall and winter
7) No specified time

5. Who administers the test?
   1) Classroom teacher
   2) Guidance Counselor
   3) School psychologist
   4) Consulting psychologist
   5) Principal or assistant principal
   6) Superintendent
   7) Other (Specify below)

6. **Who scores the test?**

1) Students
2) Clerk
3) Classroom teacher
4) Counselor or other pupil personnel worker
5) Principal or other administrator
6) School-owned scoring machine
7) Test publisher's scoring service
8) Test scoring company other than test publisher
9) Other (Specify below)

7. Who records the test scores?

1) Students
2) Clerk
3) Teacher
4) Principal or other administrator
5) Counselor or other pupil personnel worker
6) Other (Specify below)

8. Are scores reported to children?

1) Yes, scores are reported routinely to all children
2) Yes, scores are reported in some cases
3) No, but interpretative explanations are given in some cases
4) No, but interpretative explanations are given in some cases
5) No, test performance is completely confidential

9. Are scores reported to parents?
   1) Yes, scores are reported routinely to all parents.
   2) Yes, scores are reported on parents' request and/or if school feels desirable
   3) No, but interpretative explanations are routinely reported to all parents
   4) No, but interpretative explanations are given on request and/or if school feels desirable
   5) No, test performance is completely confidential

10. Are scores available to teachers?

1) Yes, teachers have scores in their files
2) Yes, teachers can get scores by consulting central files
3) Yes, teachers can get scores in consultation with principal or pupil personnel worker
4) No, test performance is completely confidential

11. How are the test results used? After indicating all the ways in which you use eac test, circle the single most important use.

1) Homogeneous ability grouping of student by classes or within classes
2) Counseling students 3) Grading student
4) To evaluate curriculum
5) To evaluate teaching staff 6) Diagnosing lear ing difficultie
7) Counseling parents 8) Other (specify)
9) These test results are not used

12. How much reliance is placed on the test results when used for the circled purpose shown in question 11?

1) A great deal
2) A moderate amount
3) Relatively little
4) Almost none
5) None
6) Not applicable

13. Who is most likely to interpret scores t parents and/or children?

1) Classroom teacher
2) Guidance counselor
3) School psychologist
4) Principal or assistant principal
5) Other (Specify below)
6) These scores are not interpreted to parents or children

DIRECTIONS FOR QUESTIONS 2-16: Please answer for EACH of the tests listed in your answer o Question 1. Write the numbers designating your answers on the lines corresponding to the nes on which the tests were listed by you. (Indicate more than one answer if appropriate.)

In what form are the scores of this test recorded in the school records? Raw score I.Q. score Stanine Standard score Grade Equivalents Age Equivalents Percentile ranks Percentile rank bands Other (Specify below)	15. What norms do you have available for use in interpreting the scores from this test? 1) Local 2) Minnesota 3) Regional 4) National 5) Other (Specify below) 6) None	16. How did you hear of the test the first time? 1) It was in this system when I came 2) A professional meeting or convention 3) A colleague told me about it 4) Article, review or advertisement in professional publication (including Buros' MMY) 5) College course 6) Publisher's catalog or bulletin 7) Department of Education consultant 8) State-Wide Testing Program consultant 9) Publisher's salesman 10) Other (Specify)

97-104. Listed below are some aids or activities which have been suggested as things which might help school personnel get increased and more effective use of standardized test results.

Please use the following scale for answering questions 97-104.

1) This would be extremely beneficial.
2) This would be nice, but we can live without it.
3) This idea holds little or no attraction for me.

For questions 97-104 write the number of the statement in the scale above which best indicates your reaction to each of the suggestions.

97._____ Local (school district) norms for your standardized tests.
98._____ Minnesota Norms for your standardized tests.
99._____ Regional Norms for your standardized tests.
100._____ Regional workshops on the interpretation and use of test results conducted by the State Department of Education or a college or university.
101._____ Consultants to work with your staff on the use of test results test selection, interpretation, etc. (At least one visit per year.)
102._____ Substantially more emphasis on the use of standardized test results in the college preparation of elementary school teachers.
103._____ A periodical publication containing items specifically for Minnesota Elementary School test-users such as new tests and developments, test reviews, reports of successful practices in other schools, research results of general interest, etc.
104._____ An elementary school counselor (as different from a school psychologist or social worker)

105-106. Write the number of the above item (97-104) which:

a) you would prefer to all others________. (105)

b) appeals least to you ________. (106)

In the following space please write any comments or suggestions you have about standardized testing in Minnesota. Both positive and negative comments are solicited. What is good, and what is not? How might things be made better? Specific suggestions for improvements are particularly desired. Do not be inhibited by considerations of feasibility or cost--let yourself go. Feel free to include comments which may seem pertinent to only your school or to all of Minnesota. Use the back pages if you need more space.

Free Response Section. Please complete the following sentences.

Tests are OK, but____

____

I wish test publishers would________________________________

____

When I was in school, tests__________________________________

____

When it comes to standardized tests our teachers____________________

____

If you have printed, mimeographed, or dittoed copies of your testing program, interpretative or other material relating to testing in your school system, please include copies with this questionnaire.

REMARKS

Please add any additional comments below. You may want to explain, expand, or qualify some information given in the body of the questionnaire. Your reactions to the study and/or the questionnaire would be welcome.

LIST OF TESTS AND CODE NUMBERS

Reading Readiness:

01. Gates Reading Readiness Tests
02. Harrison-Stroud Reading Readiness Profiles
03. Lee-Clark Reading Readiness Test
04. Metropolitan Reading Tests
00. Other Reading Readiness Test (Specify)

Reading Test (other than tests which are part of this instructional reading program materials):

11. New Developmental Reading Tests (Bond, Balow, Hoyt)
12. Diagnostic Reading Tests (Triggs)
13. Gates Basic Reading Tests
14. Gates Reading Survey
15. Iowa Silent Reading Tests
16. Lee-Clark Reading Test
17. Nelson-Denny Reading Test
18. Reading Comprehension: Cooperative English Tests
19. SRA Reading Record
10. Other Reading Test (Specify)

Individual I.Q. Test:

21. Revised Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale
22. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS)
23. Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC)
20. Other individual I.Q. Test (Specify)

Group Intelligence or Scholastic Aptitude Test:

31. ACE Psychological Examination (ACE)
32. California Test of Mental Maturity (CTMM)
33. Cooperative School and College Ability Tests (SCAT)
34. Henmon-Nelson Tests of Mental Ability
35. Kuhlmann-Anderson Intelligence Tests
36. Kuhlmann-Finch Tests
37. Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Tests (LTIT)
38. Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Tests

39. SRA Tests of Educational Ability
40. Other Group Intelligence or Scholastic Aptitude Test (Specify)

Multi-Aptitude Batteries

41. Differential Aptitude Tests (DAT)
42. Flanagan Aptitude Classification Tests (FACT)
43. The Guilford-Zimmerman Aptitude Survey
44. Holzinger-Crowder Uni-Factor Tests
45. Jastak Test of Potential Ability and Behavior Stability
46. Multiple Aptitude Tests (California Test Bureau)
47. SRA Primary Mental Abilities
40. Other Multi-Aptitude Battery (Specify)

Achievement Batteries (not including subject-matter achievement tests for specific subjects):

51. California Achievement Tests
52. Coordinated Scales of Attainment
53. Essential High School Content Battery
54. Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS)
55. Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITED)
56. Metropolitan Achievement Tests
57. National Educational Development Tests (NEDT)
58. Pupil Record of Educational Progress (PREP)
59. SRA Achievement Series
61. SRA High School Placement Test
62. Sequential Tests of Educational Progress (STEP)
63. Stanford Achievement Test
60. Other Achievement Battery (Specify)

Interest Tests and Inventories:

71. Brainerd Occupational Preference Inventory
72. Gordon Occupational Check List

73. Kuder Preference Record--Occupational
74. Kuder Preference Record--Vocational
75. Minnesota Vocational Interest Inventory (Clark)
76. Strong Vocational Interest Blank--Men
77. Strong Vocational Interest Blank--Women
78. Your Educational Plans (SRA)
70. Other Interest Test or Inventory (Specify)

Personality or Character Tests and Check-Lists:

81. Bell Adjustment Inventory
82. California Psychological Inventory
83. California Test of Personality
84. Edwards Personal Preference Schedule
85. Kuder Preference Record--Personal
86. Minnesota Counseling Inventory (MCI)
87. Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI)
88. Mooney Problem Check-List
89. SRA Junior Inventory
91. SRA Youth Inventory
92. Study of Values (Allport, Vernon, Lindzey)
80. Other Character or Personality Test or Check-List (Specify)

Study Skills:

05. Brown-Holtzman Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes
06. California Study Methods Survey
07. Spitzer Study Skills Test
08. Study Habits Inventory (Wrenn)
09. Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal
90. Other Study Skills Test (Specify)

March, 1966

MINNESOTA

TESTING SURVEY

SECONDARY LEVEL, GRADES 7-12

The Testing Subcommittee of the Minnesota State Board of Education's Advisory Committee on Guidance, Counseling, and Testing, with support from funds made available through the National Defense Education Act, has recently undertaken a study of the use of standardized tests in Minnesota schools. This study should do much to improve the quality and scope of future guidance and testing decisions in Minnesota schools and help them and agencies working with them to improve services provided to Minnesota students.

Minnesota educators have long felt the need for a comprehensive survey of testing practices in Minnesota schools. Despite the widespread use of tests, we still have distressingly little knowledge of the actual testing practices in our schools. Agencies furnishing services to schools, such as the State Department of Education and the various colleges and universities, are constantly seeking ways to improve the quality and effectiveness of their services. Good information concerning actual testing practices can help to improve these services.

Realizing the importance of and the widespread interest in a project of this nature, we have sought counsel of the following organizations whose suggestions have been incorporated into the survey. This project has the interest and co-operation of these organizations:

- Minnesota Association of School Administrators
- Minnesota Elementary Principals Association
- Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals
- Minnesota Counselors Association

Of course, all replies will be strictly confidential and no school, counselor, or administrator will be identified in the final report.

A copy of the final report will be sent to each participating school. A second copy of the questionnaire is enclosed for your files.

We thank you in advance for your cooperation in this study. We hope and believe that this survey will result in noticable benefits for each Minnesota high school.

Do not hesitate to contact the project director if you have any further questions or comments about this study.

Paul E. Ingwell
Dr. Paul Ingwell, Chairman
St. Cloud State College

Gary Joselyn
Gary Joselyn, Project Director
Student Counseling Bureau
University of Minnesota

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Phone: 612-373-5151

SECONDARY SCHOOL QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to find out what standardized tests are used in your school and how they are used. We are interested only in published tests, such as those sold by commercial test publishers or those developed by and used in quantity throughout an entire state or city school system, not tests made up and given by individual teachers in the normal course of instruction. In addition to a description of your school's standardized testing program, you are asked for some background information about your school and the pupils in your school.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR PERSONS WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR MORE THAN ONE SECONDARY SCHOOL

The questions below are designed to gain information about testing practices for your entire school district. If your district operates more than one secondary building and if there are differences in practices between buildings, please answer the questions for one specific, "typical", building and attach an additional sheet indicating the differences in testing programs between this building and the others.

DIRECTIONS

Please place a check or fill in the information in all blanks which apply. Check more than one response if necessary in order to give full information.

1-5______________________________

School District____
Name Number

Name of School______________________________Phone______________

Name of person completing questionnaire______________________________

6. Title of person completing questionnaire:

1)_____Superintendent
2)_____Principal
3)_____Curriculum Director
4)_____Director of Secondary Education
5)_____Teacher
6)_____Pupil Personnel Administrator (Director of Special Services)
7)_____Guidance Director or Counselor
8)_____Psychologist
0)_____Other (Specify:______________________________)

7. Sex: 1)_____Male 2)_____Female

8-11. Write in the number of school buildings your school district operates.

8-9.______Junior High School Buildings.
10.______Senior High School Buildings.
11.______Junior-Senior High School Buildings.

12. If there is more than one secondary school in your district for students of the same grade level, is the testing program essentially the same in each building?

1)_____Not applicable (have only one building)
2)_____Yes
3)_____No (Please attach a separate sheet of paper describing the differences.)

13-24. Write in the number of persons your school district has assigned as:

13-14.______Guidance counselor(s), full-time.
15-16.______Guidance counselor(s), part-time.
17-18.______School psychologist(s), full-time.
19-20.______School psychologist(s), part-time.
21-22.______Social worker(s) (visiting teacher), full-time.
23-24.______Social worker(s) (visiting teacher), part-time.

25-26.______How many of those listed above as engaged in counseling, psychological work, or social work have had formal training (at least one graduate course) in testing and test interpretation?

27. Does the principal have any time specifically assigned to counseling and guidance?

1)_____Yes 2)_____No

28. If yes, does he have training as described in items 25-26?

1)_____Yes 2)_____No

29. In general, are students in your school assigned to sections or classes according to their abilities or aptitudes?

1)_____Yes, most or all students in most or all sections.
2)_____Yes, most or all students in some sections (Specify:______________
____)
3)_____Yes, gifted students only
4)_____Yes, slow learners only
5)_____Yes, gifted and slow learners
6)_____Yes, some are assigned for some specific aptitude or program such as music, foreign language, etc. (Specify:______________________
____)
7)_____No

30. Are students grouped within classes (or sections) according to their abilities or aptitudes for instructional purposes?

1)______Yes, most or all students in all classes (or sections)
2)______Yes, most or all students in some classes (Specify:______________
____)
3)______Yes, gifted students only
4)______Yes, slow learners only
5)______Yes, gifted and slow learners
6)______Yes, but only for specific projects (Specify:______________
____)
7)______No

31. How active (Proportion of parents involved and/or frequency of meetings) is the Parent-Teacher Association?

1)______Very active
2)______Moderately active
3)______Only slightly active
4)______There is no Parent-Teacher Association

32. In which one of the following ways has the Parent-Teacher Association had the greatest effect on your school's testing program during the last five years?

1)______It has had no effect at all
2)______It has caused an increase in the program
3)______It has caused a decrease in the program
4)______It has changed the program in some other way (Specify:______________
____)
5)______There is no Parent-Teacher Association.

33-34. Indicate by as many check marks (✓) as needed who is or was involved in the development of your testing program as it now exists.

01)______Testing committee
02)______Classroom teacher(s)
03)______Principal(s)
04)______Superintendent or assistant superintendent
05)______Director of secondary education or secondary supervisor
06)______Curriculum director
07)______Counselor or other pupil personnel specialist
08)______Consultants from colleges or universities
09)______Consultants from State Department of Education
10)______Consultants from commercial test publishers
11)______Salesman from commercial test publisher
12)______Can't really say who was responsible for its development; it has been this way for a long time.
13)______Other (Specify:______________________________________)

35-36.______Next write in the number opposite the one person(s) above bearing primary responsibility for the development of the testing program.

37. Do you have a secondary school testing committee which operates independently of the elementary schools(s)?

1)_____Yes 2)_____No

If yes, list membership by title (i.e. teacher, principal, psychologist, etc.)

______________________ ______________________

______________________ ______________________

______________________ ______________________

______________________ ______________________

38. Does your school district (K-12) have an active testing committee?

1)_____Yes 2)_____No

If yes, list membership by title (i.e. teacher, principal, etc.)

______________________ ______________________

______________________ ______________________

______________________ ______________________

______________________ ______________________

39. Have personnel from the elementary level (other than the superintendent) participated in the development of the secondary school testing program?

1)_____Yes 2)_____No

40-44. Within this and the past two years has your school been visited by any of the following?

(1) Yes	(2) No	
_____	_____	40. Guidance consultant from the State Department of Education (Reynold Erickson, Julius Kerlan, Dean Miller)
_____	_____	41. Consultant from the State-Wide Testing Programs, Student Counseling Bureau, University of Minnesota (Gary Joselyn)
_____	_____	42. Other guidance or counseling consultant from any Minnesota college or university (Specify:__________ __________________)
_____	_____	43. Consultant from commercial test publisher (Specify: __________________)
_____	_____	44. Other consultant (Specify:__________ __________________)

45. In general, how do your teachers learn of students' test scores once they are available in the school building?

1)______Test results are placed in the files in the central office and any teacher who wishes may look them up.

2)______Test results are placed in the files in the principal's office or in the guidance counselor's office and any teacher who wishes may learn of them in consultation with the principal or guidance counselor.

3)______Test results are sent directly to each teacher who keeps them in his own file.

4)______Test results are completely confidential and are not available to teachers.

5)_____Other (Describe:____
____)

46. How many general faculty meetings would you say are usually held each year for the primary purpose of discussing and interpreting test results?

1)_____None
2)_____One
3)_____Two
4)_____Three
5)_____Four or more

47. Does your curriculum (Grades 7-12) include any specific "Guidance" or "Occupations" units?

1)_____Yes
2)_____No

48-53. If yes,

In what grade(s)?	Length of unit in weeks:	Are test scores reported to pupils and/or parents as part of unit?
48.____________	49.__________	50.Yes_____(1) No_____(2)
51.____________	52.__________	53.Yes_____(1) No_____(2)

54. Is your school planning to make any significant changes in its testing program within the next year?

1)_____Yes
2)_____No

55-77. Please use the following scale for answering questions 55-77:

This change:
1) is not needed or planned
2) is needed but not planned
3) is planned but is not needed
4) is both needed and planned

Some schools may be considering one or more of the changes listed below for their testing programs. For questions 55-77 write in the number of the statement in the scale above that best indicates your reaction to each change suggested for your testing program.

55)_____To introduce or use more reading tests (other than tests which are part of the instructional reading program materials)

56)_____To use fewer or no reading tests

57)_____To introduce or use more individual intelligence tests

58)_____To use fewer or no individual intelligence tests

59)_____To introduce or use more group intelligence or scholastic aptitude tests

60)_____To use fewer or no group intelligence or scholastic aptitude tests

61)_____To introduce or use a different group intelligence or scholastic aptitude test than we are now using

62)_____To introduce or use more multi-aptitude batteries

63)_____To use fewer or no multi-aptitude batteries

64)_____To introduce or use a different multi-aptitude battery than we are now using

65)_____To introduce or use more standardized achievement test batteries

66)_____To use fewer or no standardized achievement test batteries

67)_____To introduce or use a different standardized achievement battery than we are now using

68)_____To introduce or use more interest tests

69)_____To use fewer or no interest tests

70)_____To introduce or use more personality or character tests

71)_____To use fewer or no personality or character tests

72)_____To improve the scoring of tests

73)_____To improve the methods of recording test results

74)_____To improve the processing and reporting of test results to teachers, counselors, or administrators

75)_____To develop more local (school district). norms

76)_____To improve the interpretation of test results to pupils and their parents

77)_____To improve the interpretation of test results to teachers, counselors, or administrators.

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

1. What standardized tests are routinely given, in grades 7-9, in your school?

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer by writing on the appropriate line the test name and code number from the "List of Tests and Code Numbers" from the center of this booklet. Please put only one test and code number on a line. If no standardized tests are given in a grade, write "None".

Example:

9th grade	37	Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test
	55	Iowa Tests of Educational Devel.

		Code No.		
7th grade	1			(Do Not Write in This Space)
8th grade	2			
9th grade	3			

2. Approximately what proportion of the pupils in the grade take the test?

   1) More than 95%
   2) 75-94%
   3) 50-74%
   4) 25-49%
   5) Less than 24%
   6) Only a small number of selected pupils

NOTE: Be sure to answer for each test listed on the opposite page.

3. How often is the test given?
   1) Once each year
   2) Twice each year
   3) More than two times a year
   4) Once every other year
   5) Some other regular schedule (Specify below)
   6) Irregularly

4. When is the test given?

1) In the fall
2) In the winter
3) In the spring
4) Both fall and spring
5) Both winter and spring
6) Both fall and winter
7) No specified time

5. Who administers the test?

1) Classroom teacher
2) Guidance counselor
3) School psychologist
4) Consulting psychologist
5) Principal or assistant principal
6) Superintendent
7) Other (Specify below)

6 Who scores the test?

1) Students
2) Clerk
3) Classroom teacher
4) Counselor or other pupil personnel worker
5) Principal or other administrator
6) School-owned scoring machine
7) Test publisher's scoring service
8) Test scoring company other than test publisher
9) Other (Specify below)

7. Who records the test scores?

1) Students
2) Clerk
3) Teacher
4) Principal or other administrator
5) Counselor or other pupil personnel worker
6) Other (Specify below)

. Are scores reported to children?

1) Yes, scores are reported routinely to all children
2) Yes, scores are reported in some cases
3) No, but interpretative explanations are routinely given to all children
4) No, but interpretative explanations are given in some cases
5) No, test performance is completely confidential

9. Are scores reported to parents?

1) Yes, scores are reported routihely to al parents.
2) Yes, scores are reported on parents' request and/or if school feels desirable
3) No, but interpretative explanations are routinely reported to all parents
4) No, but interpretative explanations are given on request and/or if school feels desirable
5) No, test performance is completely confidential

10. Are scores available to teachers?

1) Yes, teachers have scores in their files
2) Yes, teachers can get scores by consulting central files
3) Yes, teachers can get scores in consultation with principal or pupil personnel worker
4) No, test performance is completely confidential

11. How are the test results used? After indicating all the ways in which you use eac test, circle the single most important use

1) Homogeneous ability grouping of student by classes or within classes
2) Counseling students 3) Grading student
4) To evaluate curriculum
5) To evaluate teaching staff
6) Diagnosing learning difficulties
7) Counseling parents 8) Other (Specify
9) These test results are not used

12. How much reliance is placed on the test results when used for the circled purpose shown in question 11?

1) A great deal
2) A moderate amount
3) Relatively little
4) Almost none
5) None
6) Not applicable

13. Who is most likely to interpret scores to parents and/or children?

1) Classroom teacher
2) Guidance counselor
3) School psychologist
4) Principal or assistant principal
5) Other (Specify below)
6) These scores are not interpreted to parents or children

DIRECTIONS FOR QUESTIONS 2-16: Please answer for EACH of the tests listed in your answer to Question 1. Write the numbers designating your answers on the lines corresponding to the ones on which the tests were listed by you. (Indicate more than one answer if appropriate.)

. In what form are the scores of this test recorded in the school records? 1) Raw score 2) I.Q. score 3) Stanine 4) Standard score 5) Grade Equivalents 6) Age Equivalents 7) Percentile ranks 8) Percentile rank bands 9) Other (Specify below)	15. What norms do you have available for use in interpreting the scores from this test? 1) Local 2) Minnesota 3) Regional 4) National 5) Other (Specify below) 6) None	16. How did you hear of the test the first time? 1) It was in this system when I came 2) A professional meeting or convention 3) A colleague told me about it 4) Article, review or advertisement in professional publication (including Buros' MMY) 5) College course 6) Publisher's catalog or bulletin- 7) Department of Education consultant 8) State-Wide Testing Program consultant 9) Publisher's salesman 10) Other (Specify below)

Reading Readiness:

01. Gates Reading Readiness Tests
02. Harrison-Stroud Reading Readiness Profiles
03. Lee-Clark Reading Readiness Test
04. Metropolitan Reading Tests
00. Other Reading Readiness Test (Specify)

Reading Test (other than tests which are part of this instructional reading program materials):

11. New Developmental Reading Tests (Bond, Balow, Hoyt)
12. Diagnostic Reading Tests (Triggs)
13. Gates Basic Reading Tests
14. Gates Reading Survey
15. Iowa Silent Reading Tests
16. Lee-Clark Reading Test
17. Nelson-Denny Reading Test
18. Reading Comprehension: Cooperative English Tests
19. SRA Reading Record
10. Other Reading Test (Specify)

Individual I.Q. Test:

21. Revised Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale
22. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS)
23. Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC)
20. Other individual I.Q. Test (Specify)

Group Intelligence or Scholastic Aptitude Test:

31. ACE Psychological Examination (ACE)
32. California Test of Mental Maturity (CTMM)
33. Cooperative School and College Ability Tests (SCAT)
34. Henmon-Nelson Tests of Mental Ability
35. Kuhlmann-Anderson Intelligence Tests
36. Kuhlmann-Finch Tests
37. Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Tests (LTIT)
38. Otis Quick-Scoring Mental Ability Tests

LIST OF TEST

39. SRA Tests of Educat
30. Other Group Intelli
Test (Specify)

Multi-Aptitude Batteries

41. Differential Aptitu
42. Flanagan Aptitude C
43. The Guilford-Zimmer
44. Holzinger-Crowder U
45. Jastak Test of Pote
Stability
46. Multiple Aptitude T
47. SRA Primary Mental
40. Other Multi-Aptitud

Achievement Batteries (not
achievement tests for sp

51. California Achievem
52. Coordinated Scales
53. Essential High Scho
54. Iowa Tests of Basic
55. Iowa Tests of Educa
56. Metropolitan Achiev
57. National Education
58. Pupil Record of Edu
59. SRA Achievement Ser
61. SRA High School Pla
62. Sequential Tests of
63. Stanford Achievemen
60. Other Achievement B

Interest Tests and Inventor

71. Brainerd Occupation
72. Gordon Occupational

CODE NUMBERS

Ability
or Scholastic Aptitude

sts (DAT)
ication Tests (FACT)
titude Survey
tor Tests
Ability and Behavior

California Test Bureau)
ies
ery (Specify)

ing subject-matter
subjects):
sts
ainment
tent Battery
s (ITBS)
Development (ITED)
Tests
lopment Tests (NEDT)
al Progress (PREP)

Test
tional Progress (STEP)

(Specify)

ference Inventory
List

---

73. Kuder Preference Record--Occupational
74. Kuder Preference Record--Vocational
75. Minnesota Vocational Interest Inventory (Clark)
76. Strong Vocational Interest Blank--Men
77. Strong Vocational Interest Blank--Women
78. Your Educational Plans (SRA)
70. Other Interest Test or Inventory (Specify)

Personality or Character Tests and Check-Lists:

81. Bell Adjustment Inventory
82. California Psychological Inventory
83. California Test of Personality
84. Edwards Personal Preference Schedule
85. Kuder Preference Record--Personal
86. Minnesota Counseling Inventory (MCI)
87. Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI)
88. Mooney Problem Check-List
89. SRA Junior Inventory
91. SRA Youth Inventory
92. Study of Values (Allport, Vernon, Lindzey)
80. Other Character or Personality Test or Check-List (Specify)

Study Skills:

05. Brown-Holtzman Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes
06. California Study Methods Survey
07. Spitzer Study Skills Test
08. Study Habits Inventory (Wrenn)
09. Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal
90. Other Study Skills Test (Specify)

SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

1. What standardized tests are routinely given, in grades 10-12, in your school?

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer by writing on the appropriate line the test name and code number from the "List of Tests and Code Numbers" from the center of this booklet. Please put only one test and code number on a line. If no standardized tests are given in a grade, write "None".

EXAMPLE:

10th grade	37	Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test
	55	Iowa Tests of Educational Development

		Code No.		
10th grade	4			(Do not write in this space)
11th grade	5	XX	Minnesota College State-Wide Testing Program (MSAT)	NOTE: Do not record participation in external testing programs (such as ACT, PSAT, CEEB) in this portion of the questionnaire. This is covered elsewhere.
12th grade	6			

2. Approximately what proportion of the pupils in the grade take the test?

1) More than 95%
2) 75-94%
3) 50-74%
4) 25-49%
5) Less than 24%
6) Only a small number of selected pupils

NOTE: Be sure to answer for each test listed on the opposite page.

3. How often is the test given?

1) Once each year
2) Twice each year
3) More than two times a year
4) Once every other year
5) Some other regular schedule (Specify below)
6) Irregularly

4. When is the test given?

1) In the fall
2) In the winter
3) In the spring
4) Both fall and spring
5) Both winter and spring
6) Both fall and winter
7) No specified time

5. Who administers the test?

1) Classroom teacher
2) Guidance counselor
3) School psychologist
4) Consulting psychologist
5) Principal or assistant principal
6) Superintendent
7) Other (Specify below)

6 Who scores the test?

1) Students
2) Clerk
3) Classroom teacher
4) Counselor or other pupil personnel worker
5) Principal or other administrator
6) School-owned scoring machine
7) Test publisher's scoring service
8) Test scoring company other than test publisher
9) Other (Specify below)

7. Who records the test scores?

1) Students
2) Clerk
3) Teacher
4) Principal or other administrator
5) Counselor or other pupil personnel worker
6) Other (Specify below)

. Are scores reported to children?

1) Yes, scores are reported routinely to all children
2) Yes, scores are reported in some cases
3) No, but interpretative explanations are routinely given to all children
4) No, but interpretative explanations are given in some cases
5) No; test performance is completely confidential

(5

9. Are scores reported to parents?

1) Yes, scores are reported routinely to all parents.
2) Yes, scores are reported on parents' request and/or if school feels desirable
3) No, but interpretative explanations are routinely reported to all parents
4) No, but interpretative explanations are given on request and/or if school feels desirable
5) No, test performance is completely confidential

10. Are scores available to teachers?

1) Yes, teachers have scores in their files
2) Yes, teachers can get scores by consulting central files
3) Yes, teachers can get scores in consultation with principal or pupil personnel worker
4) No, test performance is completely confidential

11. How are the test results used? After indicating all the ways in which you use ea test, circle the single most important us

1) Homogeneous ability grouping of studen by classes or within classes
2) Counseling students 3) Grading studen
4) To evaluate curriculum
5) To evaluate teaching staff
6) Diagnosing learning difficulties
7) Counseling parents 8) Other (Specify
9) These test results are not used

12. How much reliance is placed on the test results when used for the circled purpose shown in question 11?

1) A great deal
2) A moderate amount
3) Relatively little
4) Almost none
5) None
6) Not applicable

13. Who is most likely to interpret scores to parents and/or children?

1) Classroom teacher
2) Guidance counselor
3) School psychologist
4) Principal or assistant principal
5) Other (Specify below)
6) These scores are not interpreted to parents or children

DIRECTIONS FOR QUESTIONS 2-16: Please answer for EACH of the tests listed in your answer o Question 1. Write the numbers designating your answers on the lines corresponding to the nes on which the tests were listed by you. (Indicate more than one answer if appropriate.)

In what form are the scores of this test recorded in the school records? 1) Raw score 2) I.Q. score 3) Stanine 4) Standard score 5) Grade Equivalents 6) Age Equivalents 7) Percentile ranks 8) Percentile rank bands 9) Other (Specify below)	15. What norms do you have available for use in interpreting the scores from this test? 1) Local 2) Minnesota 3) Regional 4) National 5) Other (Specify below) 6) None	16. How did you hear of the test the first time? 1) It was in this system when I came 2) A professional meeting or convention 3) A colleague told me about it 4) Article, review or advertisement in professional publication (including Buros' MMY) 5) College course 6) Publisher's catalog or bulletin 7) Department of Education consultant 8) State-Wide Testing Program consultant 9) Publisher's salesman 10) Other (Specify below)

78-87. Are the following types of report card marks or verbal reports regularly given to parents of your pupils?

Report Card Marks		Other Reports		
(1) Yes	(2) No	(1) Yes	(2) No	Marks or reports that show the level of a student's achievement relative to:
78. ___	___	83.___	___	standards set by his teacher.
79. ___	___	84.___	___	standards set by the school system.
80. ___	___	85.___	___	the average achievement in his class group.
81. ___	___	86.___	___	his own level of mental ability.
82. ___	___	87.___	___	his own level of effort.

88. To what extent are the parents of pupils in your school provided with information about their children's aptitudes for learning school subjects?

1)_____This is never done

2)_____This is done if the parents especially request it

3)_____This is done if a teacher, counselor, or principal takes the initiative in doing it for individual pupils.

4)_____Both 2) and 3)

5)_____This is done routinely on all report cards and/or in the parent-teacher conferences.

89-90. What is the primary method of reporting to your parents in Junior and Senior High School?

89. Grades 7-9.	90. Grades 10-12.	
1)______	1)________	Report cards.
2)______	2)________	Written report or letter from teacher.
3)______	3)________	Parent-Teacher conferences.
4)______	4)________	Parent-Teacher conferences at which report card is given out.
5)______	5)________	Other (Specify:_________________)

91-92. Is your school district participating in Title V-A , National Defense Education Act for 1965-66?

91. Reimbursement for guidance and counseling program?
1)_____Yes 2)_____No

92. Reimbursement for approved tests only?
1)_____Yes 2)_____No

93-104. Do the individual pupil records ("Cumulative" or "Permanent" records) at your school contain information for most of your pupils in these areas? (Do not include information contained in counselor's case notes)

	(1) Yes	(2) No	
93.	___	___	Performance in school subjects
94.	___	___	Family and home life
95.	___	___	Non-academic skills and abilities
96.	___	___	Intelligence and academic aptitudes
97.	___	___	Aesthetic and artistic abilities
98.	___	___	Aspirations and ambitions
99.	___	___	Interests
100.	___	___	Personality and character
101.	___	___	Health
102.	___	___	Participation in school-sponsored, non-academic activities (athletics, band, dramatics, etc.)
103.	___	___	Participation in activities not sponsored by the school (4-H, Boy Scouts, etc.)
104.	___	___	Other (Specify:______________________________)

105. How many persons does your system have assigned to work with individual pupils in remedial reading?

1)________Part time 2)________Full time

106. Does your curriculum include a formal unit or course devoted specifically to developmental reading instruction? (Not remedial reading)

1)______Yes 2)______No

107-116. If yes,

At what grade levels?	What percent of the pupils in this grade are included?	Length of unit in weeks:	Are standardized reading tests used to select or place pupils in this unit?
107.__________	108.____________	109-110.________	111.Yes___(1) No___(2)
112.__________	113.____________	114-115.________	116.Yes___(1) No___(2)

117. Does your school use any aptitude tests for specific subject-matter areas? (Examples of the kinds of tests we have in mind are: Turse Shorthand Aptitude Test Orleans Geometry Prognosis Test California Algebra Aptitude)

1)______Yes 2)______No

If yes, write in the name of the test, the course or courses for which it is intended to measure aptitude, and the grade level in which it is administered.

Test Name	Course for Which Used	Grade
____________________	____________________	__________
____________________	____________________	__________
____________________	____________________	__________
____________________	____________________	__________
____________________	____________________	__________
____________________	____________________	__________

118. Does your school use any standardized, subject matter achievement tests? (Examples of the kinds of tests which we have in mind are:

Minnesota High School Achievement Examinations
Cooperative Physics Test
Nelson Biology Test
Turse-Durost Shorthand Achievement Test)

1)_____Yes 2)_____No

If yes, write in the name of the test, the course for which it is used, and the grade in which it is used.

Test Name	Course in Which Used	Grade

119-126. External Testing. Please indicate the approximate number and percentage of your students taking the following tests this year.

TEST		NUMBER	PERCENT OF CLASS	
American College Testing Program (ACT)				(119)
College Entrance Examination Boards (CEEB)				(120)
National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test(NMSQT)				(121)
Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test(PSAT)	Grade 11			(122)
	Grade 12			(123)
Minnesota Mathematics Test (MMT)				(124)
General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB)				(125)
Airman Qualifying Test (AQT)				(126)

127. Other than tests used in the programs listed in the previous item, does your school administer any tests to students for which the students pay the costs?

1)_____Yes 2)_____No

If yes, write in the name of the test and the grade in which it is used.

TEST	GRADE

128-134. Listed below are some suggested aids or activities which might help school personnel get increased and more effective use of their standardized test results.

For items 128-134 write the number of the statement in the scale below which best indicates your reaction to each of the suggestions.

1) This would be extremely beneficial.
2) This would be nice, but we can live without it.
3) This idea holds little or no attraction for me.

128._____Local (school district) norms for your standardized tests (where none now exist).

129._____Minnesota Norms for your standardized tests (where none now exist)

130._____Regional Norms for your standardized tests.

131._____More consultants to work with your staff on the use of test results, test selection, interpretation, etc. (At least one visit each year)

132._____Regional workshops on the interpretation and use of test results conducted by the State Department of Education or a college or university on a regular basis.

133._____Substantially more emphasis on the use of standardized test results in the college preparation of secondary school teachers.

134._____A periodical publication containing items specifically for Minnesota High School Test-Users such as new tests and developments, test reviews, reports of successful practices in other schools, research results of general interest, etc.

135._____Substantially more interpretative materials and data for specific tests than is now available in Manuals or from other sources.

136-137. Write in the number of the above item (128-134) which:

a) you would prefer to all the others________. (136)

b) appeals least to you ________. (137)

In the following space please write any comments or suggestions you have about standardized testing in Minnesota. Both positive and negative comments are solicited. What is good, and what is not? How might things be made better? Specific suggestions for improvements are particularly desired. Do not be inhibited by considerations of feasibility or cost -- let yourself go. Feel free to include comments which may seem pertinent to only your school or to all of Minnesota. Use the next pages if necessary.

Free Response Section. Please complete the following sentences.

Tests are OK, but

I wish test publishers would

When I was in school, tests

When it comes to standardized tests our teachers

If you have printed, mimeographed, or dittoed copies of your testing program, interpretative or other material relating to testing in your school system, please include copies with this questionnaire.

REMARKS

Please add any additional comments below. You may want to explain, expand, or qualify some information given in the body of the questionnaire. Your reactions to the study and/or the questionnaire would be welcome.